

Canada Law Commission How to use the law
Canada

MAY 25 1973



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/journalsofhouse118cana>



JOURNALS
OF THE
HOUSE OF COMMONS
OF
CANADA

From Thursday, February 17, 1972, to Friday, September 1, 1972,
both days inclusive, in the Twenty-First Year of the Reign
of our Sovereign Lady, Queen Elizabeth the Second

FOURTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT OF CANADA

THE HONOURABLE LUCIEN LAMOUREUX, SPEAKER

SESSION 1972

PRINTED BY ORDER OF PARLIAMENT

QUEEN'S PRINTER FOR CANADA
OTTAWA, 1972

VOLUME CXVIII

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTEENTH VOLUME

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Proclamation	vii
Journals of the House of Commons	1
Proclamation re Dissolution	513
List of Appendices to the Journals	515
Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of Standing and Special Committees not reported or deemed reported to the House of Commons ..	519
The Ministry and their Parliamentary Secretaries	521
Officers of the House of Commons	523
Alphabetical List of Members with their Constituencies	525
Alphabetical List of Constituencies and Members thereof	529
Index to Journals	533



CANADA

PROCLAMATION

ROLAND MICHENER
[L.S.]

CANADA

ELIZABETH THE SECOND, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom,
Canada and Her other Realms and Territories QUEEN, Head of the
Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith.

To OUR Beloved and Faithful the SENATORS of Canada, and the MEMBERS elected
to serve in the House of Commons of Canada and to each and every
of you,

GREETING:

A PROCLAMATION

DONALD S. MAXWELL, }
Deputy Attorney General }
of Canada }
WHEREAS the Meeting of Our Parliament of
Canada stands prorogued to Thursday, the
seventeenth day of the month of February, 1972,
these Presents are therefore to command and enjoin you and each of you and
all others in this behalf interested that on the said Thursday, the seventeenth
day of the month of February, 1972, at half-past ten o'clock in the forenoon,
at Our City of Ottawa, personally you be and appear for the DESPATCH OF
BUSINESS, to treat, do, act and conclude upon those things which in Our said
Parliament of Canada, by the Common Council of Canada, may, by the favour
of God, be ordained.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent
and the Great Seal of Canada to be hereunto affixed. WITNESS: Our
Right Trusty and Well-beloved Counsellor, Roland Michener, Chan-
cellor and Principal Companion of Our Order of Canada upon whom
We have conferred Our Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor
General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

AT OUR GOVERNMENT HOUSE, in Our City of Ottawa, this sixteenth day of
February in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and
seventy-two and in the twenty-first year of Our Reign.

By Command,

D. H. W. HENRY,
Deputy Registrar General of Canada.

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN

No. 1

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

This being the day on which Parliament has been convoked by Proclamation of the Governor General for the despatch of business, and the Members of the House being assembled:

PRAYERS

Mr. Speaker communicated to the House the following letter:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
OTTAWA

17th February 1972

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will arrive at the Main Entrance of the Parliament Buildings at 10.35 a.m. on this day, Thursday the 17th of February, 1972, and when it has been signified that all is in readiness, will proceed to the Chamber of the Senate to open formally the Fourth Session of the Twenty-eighth Parliament of Canada.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

ESMOND BUTLER,

Secretary to the Governor General.

The Honourable,

The Speaker of the House of Commons.

A Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

"Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate".

The House attended accordingly;

And being returned.

Mr. Trudeau, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-1, An Act respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office, which was read the first time.

Mr. Speaker reported that, when the House did attend His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament, and to prevent mistakes, he had obtained a copy, which is as follows:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

This reunion of your two Houses with the Representative of the Crown marks the beginning of the 4th Session of the 28th Parliament of Canada.

Before proceeding to the business of the new Session I should like to thank you in the name of our Queen and on behalf of all Canadians for your efforts and accomplishments during the long 3rd Session which began the 8th of October 1970 and was concluded only yesterday.

During that period there was a continuing celebration of centennials connected with the foundation of the Canadian Confederation. Manitoba and the Northwest Territories concluded ceremonies which marked the 100th anniversary of their incorporation into the Dominion. The admission of British Columbia, which gave Canada its place on the Pacific Ocean, was commemorated in 1971 with much enthusiasm and a multitude of ceremonies and projects. As in the year before, our gracious Queen and other members of the Royal Family marked the event with an extensive tour, much to the delight of British Columbians and Canadians generally.

It gave my wife and me much satisfaction to take official part on several occasions in the British Columbia celebrations, as well as to travel abroad on behalf of Canada to The Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg and Iran, in response to invitations from the heads of these States so well disposed towards Canada.

Since last I addressed you some 16 months ago, events in Canada and elsewhere have continued to demonstrate the turbulence of this age of changing values and shifting attitudes. We have witnessed with sadness outbursts of violence beyond our shores as despairing men and women have chosen to settle their differences through the use of force, extending in some cases to actual war. We have witnessed as well a period of international economic uncertainty which affected all of the industrialized nations of the world and which has made us increasingly aware of our dependence on a strong economic base in the pursuit of our social goals.

We learned in months gone by that Canada was not immune from internal pressures. In October, 1970 one of the most difficult national challenges in many years was met calmly, with discipline, and with the strong support of the people of Canada. There were sad moments but there were also memorable examples of resoluteness and courage.

More recently, we learned from another type of challenge, this time of an economic nature and coming from without rather than within, that Canada and Canadians possessed the stamina and the resilience to overcome this form of adversity as well.

Throughout, pressures for change around the world emphasized to us that the excitement and the promise

of modern technological achievements become hollow and mocking to those who find in society little understanding of their hopes and little provision for their needs. In a period dominated by bigness, in an increasingly impersonal social system, one of the major challenges facing government is to remove the impression of isolation which so often surrounds men and women, depriving them of their sense of worth, of accomplishment, of fulfilment, and removing from them their identity as individuals.

Isolation takes many forms in Canada—physical distance, social stigma, economic deprivation. In each of those forms it represents a degree of rejection, of exclusion, of estrangement. This country fails in its essential purpose if it does not ensure that its most precious resource, human talent, is not wasted away. Our challenge is to remove the barriers that create isolation, to permit each Canadian to detect—even if not always able to fulfil—his own potential, to ensure that his image of Canada is one of promise and compassion.

Every one of us is enriched through involvement in this stimulating process we call Canada. Our goals and hopes are bound up in the restlessness and vitality of this rich land. We in this place have a special responsibility to help bring these goals and those hopes within reach, to make real the Canada of which our forefathers dreamed: a land so large that some of it will remain always serene and unspoiled; a society which believes in the dignity of every single individual; a community which husbands its resources and shares them justly among this generation and those to follow; an enterprise which permits and provokes each Canadian to contribute his skills and his talents.

There will be opportunity in this session of this Parliament to pursue these ends. The Government will lay before you proposals to continue the development of our national wealth, to deal more compassionately with those in our midst who require help, to involve more Canadians in the ferment and satisfaction of community activities, to protect our natural heritage, and to strengthen our sense of identity and our image of ourselves.

* * *

Economic security is one of the most effective forces with which to counter social isolation. Job opportunities must be found and income uncertainties overcome if all Canadians are to share in the richness of this land. To permit the protection and enhancement of those values and those rights which distinguish Canada as a human place, a sound economy is absolutely essential. The attainment of such an economy retains a high priority in the Government's continuing programme. The social phenomenon of economic instability is present today in every industrialized country. We are fortunate that its ill effects have been less pronounced in Canada than elsewhere. Our success in increasing our real gross national product, in the creation of new jobs, and in the maintenance of price stability has been achieved through a policy which encourages an economic environ-

ment within which business and all elements of society are able to benefit. At the same time the Government has worked to strengthen and promote the economies of the less developed regions of Canada. Simultaneously, a range of programmes has been introduced to deal with the specific problems of those localities and individuals affected by unemployment at different times of the year.

Unemployment continues to be a matter of intense concern to the Government and will remain a primary focus of attention and action. Co-operation with the business and industrial communities will be extended even further to ensure a favourable business climate. As the economy continues to gain momentum, the private sector will be able increasingly to provide jobs for those Canadians in need of them. The Government will nevertheless redouble its efforts to make sure that as many jobs as possible are available and that the fullest possible use is made of the skills and initiatives of those who are seeking work. It will at the same time continue to exert its influence to prevent the erosion of incomes through the maintenance of reasonably stable prices of the goods and services required by Canadians.

Our economy is dependent, as are the economies of all industrialized countries, on the imagination of entrepreneurs and their use of research and innovation, as well as upon a rational industrial strategy. You will be informed in months to come of government proposals for improved policies in these areas which will be of immense importance to the long term development of our country: of policies for the use of science and technology designed to contribute not only to industry but the qualitative improvement of the life of Canadians, of an industrial strategy prepared for the peculiar character of the Canadian economy. The basis of each will be spelled out as the session proceeds.

For more than a decade an issue which has attracted increasing interest and growing debate in this country has been that of the control of our economic environment. The debate has emphasized the dual aspects of Canada's identity and of economic benefit for Canadians. Further steps will be taken towards the resolution of this issue.

These policy proposals have been designed with a blend of realism and imagination, as Canada itself was designed more than a century ago. They are intended to permit this country to attain a degree of leadership and independence in selected fields of endeavour while reducing overall Canadian vulnerability to events both expected and unexpected from beyond our shores.

A further imperative in the structuring of strong, internationally competitive industry is the development of a modern and workable competition policy. The development of such a policy, designed to achieve an efficient and innovative economy, capable of rapid growth and dynamic change, must proceed through consultation with all sectors of Canadian society. During the coming weeks the Government will continue this consultative process and will place before Parliament a revised policy re-

flecting the informed and constructive comments received and assistance gained.

A major factor in the strength of the Canadian economy is provided by exports. The Government will pursue vigorously the initiatives it has taken throughout the world to develop and maintain Canadian markets. Those advantages already gained by ministerial missions to other countries will be enlarged in a number of ways. One of these will involve the provision of better credit facilities. The private financial sector will be encouraged to involve itself increasingly in export financing. The Government will continue to develop programmes to strengthen secondary industry. Closer scientific and technological co-operation with other countries can be expected. Trade negotiations will seek to enlarge opportunities for Canadian manufacturers and the consultative machinery with the European Economic Community and its member states will be strengthened. Negotiations will continue with the United States so as to extend the benefits gained by each member of the world's most important trading partnership.

Policies designed to promote a related, yet distinct, sector of the economy—tourism, will be revealed in coming weeks.

A basic building block in the growth of Canada's national wealth has been the performance of our resource and energy industries. Over the years they have opened new frontiers and stimulated the development of the sinews and muscles of Canada; they have accumulated capital for reinvestment, enhanced the scientific and technical skills of Canadians, and accounted for a healthy export surplus. A continuation and strengthening of government-industry relations is necessary in order that such areas of challenge as environmental impact and the increasing demand both within Canada and abroad for resources and energy be fully addressed.

The competitive requirements for northern development will continue to be recognized; development will not be permitted at the expense of the northern peoples and the northern environment. To ensure the involvement of the residents of the north, and their participation in the design of their own future, there will be continued support for the development of local government in the northern territories.

Canada's primary food producers—our farmers and our fishermen—form one of the traditional and still basic strengths of our economy. Their continued productivity and livelihood is of immense importance to the Government and to the country. Improvements and achievements of the past several months will be strengthened and continued. Measures already undertaken and which have substantially improved prices to fishermen—upwards of 50 per cent in some cases—will be extended, ensuring that the benefits of price support for fish products go to the fishermen themselves. Wheat farmers will be assured of an increased return equivalent to the higher price for wheat consumed as food by Canadians. To avoid distortions in food prices, the cost of this pro-

gramme will be borne by the Treasury rather than by the consumer; to avoid distortions in production, a formula for distribution will be proposed which relates payments to grain acreage rather than to actual wheat production. The Government will assist further the position of farmers and fishermen through the implementation of several programmes. It proposes the establishment of new national marketing agencies and the implementation of a small farm development programme. The recent extensions of fisheries closing lines will permit the Government to engage more actively in the management of its marine resources so as to increase the supply of fish available to Canadian fishermen in the waters off our coasts.

Both the effectiveness and the quality of any programme for the provision of services to Canadians depends increasingly upon a harmonious fiscal relationship between the Federal government and the governments of the ten provinces. Legislation will be introduced, therefore, proposing the renewal and improvement of equalization arrangements, increasing to 100 percent the level of stabilization of provincial revenues, and a number of other items. These will include the administration on behalf of requesting provinces of succession duties and gift taxes, the extension for two years of the transfers to provinces respecting post-secondary education, the provision of a five-year revenue guarantee to provinces to protect their income tax revenues under the new system, and the sharing with provinces of the special tax on undistributed corporate income.

As a further protection against the isolation of individuals caused by economic deprivation, the fundamental reform of protective measures which commenced last year with the new Unemployment Insurance Act will continue. A new Canada Labour Code, reflecting the many representations received in past months, will be introduced as will important amendments to the Fair Employment Practices Act. The Canada Manpower programmes will be improved and additional steps will be taken to make the training and placement services adequate to the needs of specially disadvantaged people whose particular problems present challenges which cannot be met with the use of regular programme resources or techniques. For those persons seeking to further their education, the loan limits under the Canada Student Loans Act will be raised, permitting students to borrow more within a given year and increasing significantly the total amount available under the programme.

* * *

The isolation which is a product of social injustice is less well understood than that which comes from economic denial. Nevertheless, its consequences dare not be ignored by any society. The irony of isolation in an urban surrounding cannot be resolved by any single act. One essential, however, is the provision of adequate housing of high standard to all Canadians. More dwelling units were started in 1971 than in any single year in our history, including a record number for lower income families. It is clear, however, that Canada's housing needs

cannot be met only through increases in scale. What is required, and what the Government will be proposing, are fresh concepts, continuing research, and imagination in neighbourhood improvement with emphasis on the need for low cost housing.

In order to achieve our goal of full participation by all members of society, all barriers leading to isolation must be removed. We cannot invite respect for our laws and support for our institutions from persons to whom they are irrelevant or ineffective. Government activities must reflect the needs of all Canadians, not only the favoured. A giant step in this direction was taken with the adoption last session of tax reform legislation which spreads more evenly the burden of social services on those Canadians best able to bear it. Another step, and long overdue, consists of policies to ensure the equality of women in Canadian society. These will be announced this session.

Protective steps will be proposed in a number of areas of wide concern to Canadians—the non-medical use of drugs, compensation for victims of crime, and the protection of privacy. Progress toward more humane treatment of offenders will continue with further reforms in the penal and parole systems. Amendments will be proposed for reforms in the administration of the criminal law. The Government is committed as well to federal participation in legal aid subject to satisfactory cost-sharing and administrative details being worked out.

It is the view of the Government that the most important single factor in the attainment of individual dignity and active social involvement is the assurance of a secure income. Considerable progress towards the goal of a total income security programme for all Canadians is achieved in the new Family Income Security Plan bill which will be presented for your consideration. The emphasis in this plan is on protection and is consistent with the Government's belief in the strong sense of self-reliance of Canadians.

* * *

The pride with which Canadians regard this country and which inspires them to identify with it springs from many sources. Some of these are physical in nature, some cultural, still others are economic. Canadians find in the vast spaces of this land, in its rugged coasts, in its throbbing vitality and in its serene tranquility something of themselves. It is the intention of the Government that immense areas of Canada be preserved in their natural state for the enjoyment of this generation and of generations to come. For the first time some of the grandeur and the wilderness which is Canada's north will be guaranteed perpetual preservation through incorporation into the National Parks System. You will be asked to approve legislation which will create three new parks north of the 60th parallel, each as large and as spectacular as any in the world. These three parks, plus the seven new parks created since 1968, mean that for the first time in our history every province and territory will include within it a national park for the benefit of our people.

Companion legislation will be introduced to provide wildlife habitats and to protect certain endangered wild-life species.

While taking care to preserve for the future, we should, wherever possible, preserve and restore those achievements of the past which are an essential element in our self-understanding as a people. You will be asked to consider, therefore, a bill creating and endowing a corporation to be known as Heritage Canada which will go far to ensure the preservation of items and collections from Canada's past and to make these accessible for the enjoyment and understanding of Canadians in all parts of the country. Heritage Canada, complemented by a broadened National Museums policy, will demonstrate the achievements of our forefathers and their successes in overcoming physical isolation and in converting dreams into reality.

Still another form of isolation springs from indifferent communications services. It is a matter of concern to the Government that at this moment many communities do not receive the national broadcasting service and that some one million Canadians in 260 communities receive no television service in their own language. The government proposes therefore, that the C.B.C. be authorized to extend its services in a comprehensive fashion and to utilize the capabilities of Canada's pioneer satellite communications system to assure within a five year period that at least 98 percent of Canadians are served.

* * *

The standards against which a society is judged by others and by history are often those chosen by the society itself. The image it projects, the values to which it adheres, the treatment it accords the disadvantaged in its midst; these are matters for each society to determine, and in determining to be judged. In our relations with one another, in federal-provincial relations, in Canada's relations with other countries, our values are both guides and distinguishing features. Canada is committed to the betterment of life for all, to the resolution of differences by reason not force, to the practice of tolerance, to the acceptance of love and understanding as the most important of human traits. The Government, therefore, will continue to participate fully in international efforts for peace and for the well-being of people everywhere. It will continue to do what it can on behalf of the Canadian people to assist those who are afflicted by calamities, both natural and man-made.

The fluidity in world affairs marked by events in the past months and those expected in the near future present to us an opportunity to deepen and enrich our relationships with our old friends and to seek and strengthen friendships with others both within and without the councils and agencies of the United Nations. Isolation within the international community is as barren and damaging as is isolation within a domestic society. The visits to Canada in 1971 of such distinguished Heads of State and Government as the Presidents of Yugoslavia, Nauru and Niger, and the Prime Ministers of the United

Kingdom, the Soviet Union, Ceylon, Ghana, Malaysia, Fiji, Senegal, and Israel illustrate the universality of Canada's attitude to the world.

Canada's lines of communication and understanding continue to stand open in all directions. In particular, our ties with our friends in the new Europe and our attachment to the United States remain of the greatest importance. A United States which is strong, dynamic and outward looking is vital to the success of Canada's international endeavours and to our ability to contribute to the well-being of fellow Commonwealth countries and of those states in receipt of Canadian economic assistance including the fellow members of l'Agence de Coopération culturelle et technique des pays francophones to whose important conference we acted with pride as host last autumn. The Government and all Canadians anticipate with considerable pleasure the visit to Canada this spring of the President of the United States and Mrs. Nixon.

* * *

Our age is marked by inconsistency. Within our societies, the trend all too often is toward increases in size and of impersonality in human relationships while on the planet itself the speed of communication has created a new intimacy among nations. In these circumstances, there is both challenge and opportunity for governments and for individuals. Canada is seized of the challenge. The Government pledges itself to turn the opportunities to the benefit of individual Canadians.

* * *

Members of the House of Commons:

During this Session, you will be asked to grant the necessary funds for the services and expenditures authorized by Parliament.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The Prime Minister will lay before you today a list of bills that will be submitted to you during the Session.

May Divine Providence guide you in your deliberations.

Mr. Trudeau, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the Speech of His Excellency delivered this day from the Throne to both Houses of Parliament be taken in' consideration later this day.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mr. Winch, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—

That the motion be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words:

"immediately after a forty minute oral question period, as provided by Standing Order 15".

And debate arising thereon;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to indicate to honourable Members that in my view the contributions which have been made to this brief procedural debate have not been addressed principally to the procedural matter. Honourable Members have suggested that it might be proper today to have a Question Period, there ought to be a Question Period today because there was not one yesterday, it is the duty of the Government to give an opportunity to honourable Members to ask questions and it is our duty to go on with Routine Proceedings. I suggest this does not have anything at all to do with the point that I brought to the attention of honourable Members.

My suggestion when the matter was raised was that the motion was not procedurally correct. I think this will have to be my ruling because I have not received much assistance from any honourable Member in this respect. The amendment is a substantive motion. It is not an amendment which can be attached to the motion before the House.

In dealing with the matter in a substantive way, honourable Members have suggested that we should proceed in the usual way with Routine Proceedings and that the motion made by the Prime Minister was made under Standing Order 43. With respect, I cannot agree with this suggestion. The motion was made on the basis of Parliamentary tradition. My understanding is that this is the kind of motion which is proposed and the proceedings which we have today are based on 100 years of Canadian practice and, I am sure, many more years of British practice. I think the Chair has a responsibility to recognize this.

One honourable Member suggested that perhaps this should be changed. That may be so. Honourable Members may feel that on the first day of the session the procedure should be changed, that we should not have the formal motions that are made and proceed in the way that we do, without Routine Proceedings, to the consideration of the Address in Response to the Speech from the Throne. However, I believe one of the responsibilities of the Speaker is not to change these traditions, but to protect them. I am prepared to do so with this particular case.

I am not suggesting that the motion cannot be amended. It could be amended. I suppose if a procedurally acceptable amendment were submitted for the consideration of the Chair, I would have no hesitation in putting the motion and calling in the Members. My conclusion and the ruling I must make, is that the amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre cannot be accepted.

And the question being put on the motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Trudeau, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—List of Measures referred to by His Excellency the Governor General in the Speech from the Throne (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/371.

Agreed—That the said list be printed in this day's *Hansard*.

Mr. Trudeau, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor General, which was read by Mr. Speaker, as follows:

ROLAND MICHENER:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a certified copy of an Order in Council appointing the Honourable Allan Joseph MacEachen, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, the Honourable Charles Mills Drury, President of the Treasury Board, the Honourable Jean Chrétien, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and the Honourable Donald Stovel Macdonald, Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of chapter H-9 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, intituled: An Act respecting the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa.

On motion of Mr. Trudeau, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, Gérald Laniel, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Beauharnois-Salaberry, was appointed Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

On motion of Mr. Trudeau, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, Prosper Boulanger, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Mercier, was appointed Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

On motion of Mr. Trudeau, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, it was ordered,—That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 2(2), the House shall meet at 11.00 o'clock a.m. on Friday, February 18, 1972, and that such sitting shall not be adjourned until the leaders of all parties have spoken in the Address Debate.

At 12.17 o'clock p.m., the sitting was suspended until 2.00 o'clock p.m.

At 2.00 o'clock p.m., the sitting was resumed.

The Order for the consideration of the Speech from the Throne delivered by His Excellency the Governor General of Canada to both Houses of Parliament being read;

Mr. Whicher, seconded by Mr. Lajoie, moved,—That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada upon whom has been conferred the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

And debate arising thereon, the said debate was, on motion of Mr. Stanfield, seconded by Mr. Bell, adjourned.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Speaker,—Report of the Parliamentary Librarian, pursuant to section 2 of the Regulations respecting the Library of Parliament. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/307.

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Return to an Order of the House dated December 16, 1970, for copies of all background papers and reports related to Chapter 8 of the Government White Paper on Proposals for Tax Reform regarding the impact on revenues and the economy.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 12*).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/12.

At 3.09 o'clock p.m., on motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Special Order.

Editorial: The Role of the Physician in the Management of the Patient with a Chronic Disease

It is a common experience for the physician to be faced with a patient who has a chronic disease. The physician's role in the management of such a patient is often a complex one, involving a variety of factors that may not be immediately apparent to the patient or the physician.

One of the most important factors in the management of the patient with a chronic disease is the physician's understanding of the patient's needs. This understanding is based on a thorough history and physical examination, as well as a knowledge of the patient's social and family background. The physician must also be aware of the patient's own beliefs and attitudes toward the disease and its treatment.

Another important factor is the physician's ability to communicate effectively with the patient. This involves not only the ability to explain the disease and its treatment in a clear and understandable way, but also the ability to listen to the patient's concerns and to respond to them in a sensitive and empathetic manner.

The physician's role in the management of the patient with a chronic disease is also influenced by the patient's own role. The patient must be actively involved in the management of the disease, and must understand the importance of adhering to the treatment plan. The physician must encourage the patient to take an active role in the management of the disease, and must provide the patient with the information and resources needed to do so.

In summary, the physician's role in the management of the patient with a chronic disease is a complex one, involving a variety of factors that must be carefully considered. The physician must understand the patient's needs, communicate effectively with the patient, and encourage the patient to take an active role in the management of the disease.

Editorial: The Role of the Physician in the Management of the Patient with a Chronic Disease

It is a common experience for the physician to be faced with a patient who has a chronic disease. The physician's role in the management of such a patient is often a complex one, involving a variety of factors that may not be immediately apparent to the patient or the physician.

One of the most important factors in the management of the patient with a chronic disease is the physician's understanding of the patient's needs. This understanding is based on a thorough history and physical examination, as well as a knowledge of the patient's social and family background. The physician must also be aware of the patient's own beliefs and attitudes toward the disease and its treatment.

Another important factor is the physician's ability to communicate effectively with the patient. This involves not only the ability to explain the disease and its treatment in a clear and understandable way, but also the ability to listen to the patient's concerns and to respond to them in a sensitive and empathetic manner.

The physician's role in the management of the patient with a chronic disease is also influenced by the patient's own role. The patient must be actively involved in the management of the disease, and must understand the importance of adhering to the treatment plan. The physician must encourage the patient to take an active role in the management of the disease, and must provide the patient with the information and resources needed to do so.

No. 2

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

One petition for a Private Bill was presented in accordance with Standing Order 67(1).

Mr. Trudeau, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of an exchange of correspondence between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, dated December 31, 1971 and January 7, 1972, with respect to the latter's resignation as Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/190.

Mr. Trudeau, laid upon the Table,—Order in Council P.C. 1972-190, dated February 3, 1972, appointing certain Members of the House of Commons to be Parliamentary Secretaries. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/205.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Whicher, seconded by Mr. Lajoie,—That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the

Order of Canada upon whom has been conferred the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Stanfield, seconded by Mr. Bell, moved in amendment thereto,—That following the words "Houses of Parliament" there be added:

"but we respectfully regret that your government has not only failed utterly to provide an economic climate in which Canadians can have confidence in the future and to give protection to Canadians against the isolation of individuals caused by economic deprivation but, in fact, has deepened the gap between the affluent and those in need."

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

“and in particular has taken no effective steps to relieve the serious unemployment situation that has affected Canadians in all parts of this country throughout its term of office.”.

And debate arising thereon; the said debate was, on motion of Mr. Deachman, seconded by Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo), adjourned.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Order in Council P.C. 1971-784, dated April 23, 1971, revoking the Yukon and Northwest Territories Electoral Districts Election Fees Tariff made by Order in Council P.C. 1963-189, dated February 6, 1963, as amended, pursuant to section 61(2) of the Canada Elections Act, chapter 14, R.S.C., 1970, 1st Supplement. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/402.

By Mr. MacEachen,—Order in Council P.C. 1971-785, dated April 23, 1971, revoking the Federal Elections Fees Tariff made by Order in Council P.C. 1963-188, dated February 6, 1963, as amended, and making in substitution therefor a new Federal Elections Fees Tariff, pursuant to section 61(2) of the Canada Elections Act, chapter 14, R.S.C., 1970, 1st Supplement. (English and French). Sessional Paper No. 284-1/402A.

By Mr. MacEachen,—Order in Council P.C. 1971-786, dated April 23, 1971, revoking the Canadian Forces General Elections Fees Tariff made by Order in Council P.C. 1963-190, dated February 6, 1963, and making in substitution therefor the Special Voting Rules General Elections Fees Tariff, pursuant to section 61(2) of the Canada Elections Act, chapter 14, R.S.C., 1970, 1st Supplement. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/402B.

By Mr. Pepin, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Quarterly Report of the Employment Support Board, for the annual quarter ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 21 of the Employment Support Act, chapter 56, Statutes of Canada, 1970-1971-1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/180.

At 4.25 o'clock p.m., on motion of Mr. Trudeau, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), the House adjourned until Monday, at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(2).

No. 3

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Andras, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-3, An Act to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965, with respect to the readjustment of representation in the House of Commons, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-4, An Act to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways System and Air Canada for the period from the 1st day of January, 1971, to the 30th day of June, 1972, and to

authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railway Company and certain debentures to be issued by Air Canada, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to authorize the Canadian National Railway to make capital expenditures including investment in securities of affiliated companies in the calendar year 1971 not exceeding in the aggregate \$219,800,000, to make capital expenditures in the first six months of the calendar year 1972 not exceeding in the aggregate \$83,000,000 for discharging obligations incurred prior to the 1st day of January, 1972, to enter into contracts prior to the 1st day of July, 1972, for equipment, additions and conversions requiring payments after the calendar year 1971 not exceeding \$162,000,000, to borrow either from Her Majesty or by means of issues of securities guaranteed by Her Majesty an amount not exceeding \$27,000,000 for construction of branch lines; to authorize

Her Majesty to make loans directly to Air Canada or to guarantee issues of securities of Air Canada not exceeding \$114,000,000 for discharging obligations of the airline that become due and payable prior to the 1st day of May, 1972; to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of debentures not exceeding the Canadian dollar equivalent of £13,000,000 to be issued by Air Canada in the period 1 July, 1972 to 31st December, 1976 in payment for certain propulsion systems and components thereof; to authorize Her Majesty to continue to purchase until December 31st, 1972, Canadian National Railway Company 4 per cent preferred stock in an annual amount not exceeding 3 per cent of the gross revenues of the Company; to extend the limit of refunding under the Canadian National Railway Refunding Act, 1955, from \$680,000,000 to one billion dollars; to authorize Her Majesty to make loans to the Canadian National Railway Company and Air Canada to meet deficiencies in operating revenues to June 30th, 1972, any such loans to be repaid from revenues of the Railway Company and Air Canada or, if revenues prove insufficient by subsequent deficit appropriation by Parliament.

Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to amend the Farm Credit Act; to increase the capital of the Farm Credit Corporation to sixty-six million dollars; to provide that the Corporation may make loans to facilitate the efficient operation of farms to be mortgaged; to limit the individuals, corporations and cooperative farm associations to which the Corporation may make loans; to provide for a maximum loan of one hundred thousand dollars to any farmer, alone or jointly with others or in respect of a single farming enterprise; to extend by regulation that the basis for determining the appraised value of farm lands may include the productive value of a secondary non-farming enterprise carried on on those farm lands; to reduce the age at which individuals may be eligible to obtain loans; to provide that the Corporation may make loans with respect to a farming enterprise that forms part of an economic unit; and to provide for other and consequential amendments to the said Act.

Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-6, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General has recommended to the House of Commons the present measure to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act respecting the protection of privacy; to create offenses relating to the invasion of privacy; and to provide that the Crown shall, in certain circumstances, be liable for punitive damages and all loss or damage caused by or attributable to the interception of a private communication, and for punitive damages and all loss or damage caused by the use or disclosure of such private communication or by the disclosure of its existence.

Mr. MacEachen for Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), seconded by Mr. Andras, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-7, An Act to amend the Explosives Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to provide for the payment to provinces out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for each fiscal year in the period commencing with the 1st day of April 1972 and ending with the 31st day of March 1977, of provincial revenue equalization payments, provincial revenue stabilization payments, provincial tax revenue guarantee payments, payments in respect of any tax paid under Part IX of the Income Tax Act by a corporation described therein and, payments in respect of post-secondary education adjustment; to authorize tax collection agreements with the provinces; and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act to extend for an additional five years the hospital insurance program and the special welfare program.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Whicher, seconded by Mr. Lajoie,—That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada upon whom has been conferred the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

And on the motion of Mr. Stanfield, seconded by Mr. Bell, in amendment thereto,—That following the words "Houses of Parliament" there be added:

"but we respectfully regret that your government has not only failed utterly to provide an economic climate in which Canadians can have confidence in the future and to give protection to Canadians against the isola-

tion of individuals caused by economic deprivation but, in fact, has deepened the gap between the affluent and those in need."

And on the motion of Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"and in particular has taken no effective steps to relieve the serious unemployment situation that has affected Canadians in all parts of this country throughout its term of office."

And debate continuing; at 9.45 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker interrupted the proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 38(3);

And the question being put on the said proposed amendment to the amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

Division No. 1

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Dinsdale,	Knowles (Winnipeg	McCleave,	Rowland,
Alexander,	Douglas,	North Centre),	McCutcheon,	Scott,
Asselin,	Downey,	Korchinski,	McGrath,	Simpson,
Baldwin,	Farweather,	Lambert	Moore,	Skoberg,
Barnett,	Flemming,	(Edmonton West),	Muir,	Southam,
Beaudoin,	Gauthier,	Laprise,	Nesbitt,	Stanfield,
Bell,	Gilbert,	La Salle,	Noble,	Stewart
Benjamin,	Godin,	Latulippe,	Nowlan,	(Marquette),
Burton,	Harding,	Lewis,	Nystrom,	Thompson
Carter,	Hellyer,	MacDonald	Orlikow,	(Red Deer),
Coates,	Howard (Skeena),	(Egmont),	Peters,	Woolliams,
Crouse,	Howe,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Ritchie,	Yewchuk—59.
Danforth,	Knight,	MacKay,	Rodrigue,	

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Comtois,	Francis,	Jerome,	Macdonald
Andras,	Corbin,	Gendron,	Lachance,	(Rosedale),
Badanai,	Crossman,	Gervais,	Laflamme,	MacEachen,
Basford,	Cullen,	Gibson,	Laing	MacGuigan,
Béchar,	Cyr,	Gillespie,	(Vancouver South),	McIlraith,
Beer,	Davis,	Goode,	Lajoie,	McNulty,
Benson,	Deachman,	Goyer,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Mahoney,
Blair,	Deakon,	Gray,	Humboldt),	Marceau,
Blouin,	De Bané,	Groos,	Langlois,	Marchand
Boulanger,	Dubé,	Guilbault,	Laniel,	(Kamloops-
Breau,	Dupras,	Haidasz,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Cariboo),
Buchanan,	Émard,	Hopkins,	Lefebvre,	Munro,
Caccia,	Éthier,	Howard (Okanagan	Legault,	Murphy,
Cafik,	Faulkner,	Boundary),	Lessard (LaSalle),	Noël,
Chappell,	Forest,	Hymmen,	L'Heureux,	O'Connell,
Chrétien,	Forget,	Isabelle,	Loiselle,	Olson,
Clermont,	Foster,	Jamieson,		Osler,

Ouellet,
Pelletier,
Penner,
Pepin,
Perrault,
Portelance,
Pringle,
Prud'homme,
Reid,

Roberts,
Robinson,
Rochon,
Rock,
Roy (Timmins),
Roy (Laval),
Serré,
Sharp,

Smith
(Northumberland-
Miramichi),
Smith
(Saint-Jean),
Stafford,
Stanbury,
Stewart
(Cochrane),

St. Pierre,
Sullivan,
Thomas
(Maisonneuve-
Rosemont),
Tolmie,
Trudeau,
Trudel,
Turner
(London East),

Turner (Ottawa-
Carleton),
Wahn,
Walker,
Watson,
Weatherhead,
Whelan,
Whicher,
Yanaklis—115.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Chrétien, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 7 of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development Act, chapter I-7, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/13.

By Mr. Goyer, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copy of a Contract between the Government of Canada and the Municipality of Unity, Saskatchewan, pursuant to subsection 3 of section 20 of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, chapter R-9, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/274.

First Report of the Clerk of Petitions, pursuant to Standing Order 67(7):

The Clerk of Petitions has the honour to report that the petition of the following, presented on February 18, 1972, meets the requirements of Standing Order 67:

Isadore Levinter and Benjamin Victor Levinter, both of Woodbridge, in the Regional Municipality of York, Ontario, Zenon Gutkowski, of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, Ontario, Adiuto John Pianosi, of the Town of Copper Cliff, Ontario and Gerald La Salle, of the City of Sherbrooke, Quebec, praying for the passing of an Act incorporating "United Bank of Canada" and, in French, "*Banque Unie du Canada*".—Mr. Haidasz.

At 10.10 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(2).

No. 4

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Notice of Ways and Means Motion to amend the Income Tax Act. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/308.

A point of order having been raised by the honourable Member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) to the effect that certain documents having been quoted by the Honourable the Solicitor General, those documents should be laid upon the Table of the House;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the argument put forward by the honourable Member for Calgary North is valid. The rule is clear enough. If a document is quoted in debate it has to be Tabled. It was suggested by the President of the Privy Council that perhaps we are not dealing here with what is termed a State document. This has always been the difficulty in the past—to determine what is a public document and what is a private document. My thought is that if a letter, even though it might have been written originally as a private letter, becomes part of the record of a department it becomes at that point a public document and a State paper. It seems to me that the docu-

ments to which the Minister has referred are part of the official penitentiary files, or documents within the possession of the officials of the department, and I would think that any document of this kind which is cited by the Minister ought to be tabled in the House.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Whicher, seconded by Mr. Lajoie,—That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada upon whom has been conferred the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

And on the motion of Mr. Stanfield, seconded by Mr. Bell, in amendment thereto,—That following the words “Houses of Parliament” there be added:

“but we respectfully regret that your government has not only failed utterly to provide an economic climate in which Canadians can have confidence in the future and to give protection to Canadians against the isolation of individuals caused by economic deprivation but, in fact, has deepened the gap between the affluent and those in need.”

And debate continuing;

Mr. Caouette, seconded by Mr. Laprise, moved in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the proposed amendment be amended by deleting all the words following “economic deprivation” and substituting therefor the words:

“due to its failure to proceed with monetary reform in accordance with the needs of the Canadian society.”

And debate arising thereon;

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to “Motions”.

Mr. Goyer, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of (1) Letter dated June 28, 1971, addressed by Yves Geoffroy to the Commissioner of Penitentiaries; (2) letter dated August 19, 1971 by Micheline Cornellier; Rehabilitation Officer to the Commissioner of Penitentiaries; (3) letter dated November 3, 1971, by the Chief, Social Education and Chaplaincy Services to the Director, St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/1.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question “That this House do now adjourn” was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Mackasey, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Report of the Department of Manpower and Immigration, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 5 of the Department of Manpower and Immigration Act, chapter M-1, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/17.

By Mr. Mackasey,—Return of Permits issued under the authority of section 8 of the Immigration Act, for the calendar year 1971, pursuant to section 8(5) of the said Act, chapter I-2, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/158.

At 10.21 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(2).

No. 5

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Drury, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor General, which was read by Mr. Speaker, as follows:

ROLAND MICHENER

His Excellency the Governor General transmits to the House of Commons the Estimates of sums required for the service of Canada for the year ending on the 31st March, 1973, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867" the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House, Ottawa.

The said Estimates, 1972-73, recorded as Sessional Paper No. 284-1/132.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That any recorded divisions on any amendment or amendments to the Address in Reply to The Speech from the Throne before the House on Friday, February 25, 1972, be deferred until 9.30 p.m., Monday, February 28, 1972.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Whicher, seconded by Mr. Lajoie,—That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada upon whom has been conferred the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

And on the motion of Mr. Stanfield, seconded by Mr. Bell, in amendment thereto,—That following the words "Houses of Parliament" there be added:

"but we respectfully regret that your government has not only failed utterly to provide an economic climate in which Canadians can have confidence in the future and to give protection to Canadians against the isolation of individuals caused by economic deprivation but,

in fact, has deepened the gap between the affluent and those in need."

And on the motion of Mr. Caouette, seconded by Mr. Laprise, in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the proposed amendment be amended by deleting all the words following "economic deprivation" and substituting therefor the words:

"due to its failure to proceed with monetary reform in accordance with the needs of the Canadian society."

And debate continuing, at 5.30 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker interrupted the proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 38(4);

And the question being put on the said proposed amendment to the amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 2)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Dionne,	Korchinski,	McGrath,	Rodrigue,
Alexander,	Douglas,	Lambert	McIntosh,	Rondeau,
Alkenbrack,	Fairweather,	(Edmonton West),	McKinley,	Rose,
Asselin,	Flemming,	Laprise,	McQuaid,	Rowland,
Baldwin,	Fortin,	Latulippe,	Marshall,	Rynard,
Barnett,	Gauthier,	Lewis,	Mather,	Saltsman,
Beaudoin,	Gilbert,	MacDonald	Matte,	Schumacher,
Bell,	Godin,	(Egmont),	Moore,	Simpson,
Benjamin,	Grills,	MacInnis (Cape	Muir,	Skoberg,
Blackburn,	Hales,	Breton-East	Murta,	Southam,
Brewin,	Harding,	Richmond),	Nesbitt,	Stewart
Broadbent,	Hees,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Noble,	(Marquette),
Burton,	Hellyer,	MacKay,	Nowlan,	Tétrault,
Cadieu,	Howard (Skeena),	MacLean,	Nystrom,	Thomas
Carter,	Howe,	Macquarrie,	Orlikow,	(Moncton),
Coates,	Knight,	MacRae,	Peddle,	Winch,
Code,	Knowles (Winnipeg	McCleave,	Peters,	Woolliams,
Crouse,	North Centre),	McCutcheon,	Ritchie,	Yewchuk—84.
Danforth,				

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Davis,	Haidasz,	Lessard	Pelletier,
Andras,	Deachman,	Hopkins,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Penner,
Badanai,	Deakon,	Howard (Okanagan	L'Heureux,	Pepin,
Barrett,	De Bané,	Boundary),	Loiselle,	Perrault,
Basford,	Drury,	Hymmen,	Macdonald	Portelance,
Bécharde,	Dubé,	Isabelle,	(Rosedale),	Pringle,
Beer,	Dupras,	Jamieson,	MacEachen,	Prud'homme,
Benson,	Énard,	Jerome,	MacGuigan,	Richardson,
Blair,	Éthier,	Kaplan,	McBride,	Robinson,
Blouin,	Faulkner,	Lachance,	McIlraith,	Rochon,
Boulanger,	Forest,	Laflamme,	McNulty,	Rock,
Caccia,	Forget,	Laing	Mahoney,	Roy (Timmins),
Cafik,	Foster,	(Vancouver South),	Marceau,	Roy (Laval),
Cantin,	Francis,	Lajoie,	Marchand	Serré,
Chappell,	Gendron,	Lang (Saskatoon-	(Langelier),	Sharp,
Chrétien,	Gervais,	Humboldt),	Marchand	Smith
Clermont,	Gibson,	Langlois,	(Kamloops-	(Northumberland-
Cobbe,	Goode,	Laniel,	Cariboo),	Miramichi),
Comtois,	Goyer,	La Salle,	Noël,	Smith
Corbin,	Gray,	Leblanc (Laurier),	O'Connell,	(Saint-Jean),
Crossman,	Groos,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Olson,	Stafford,
Cullen,	Guay (St. Boniface),	Lefebvre,	Osler,	Stanbury,
Cyr,	Guay (Lévis),	Legault,	Otto,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Danson,	Guilbault,	Lessard (LaSalle),	Ouellet,	Kootenay),

St. Pierre,
Sulatycky,
Thomas
(Maisonneuve-
Rosemont),

Tolmie,
Trudeau,
Trudel,

Turner
(London East),
Turner (Ottawa-
Carleton),

Wahn,
Watson,
Whelan,

Whicher,
Whiting,
Yanakis—122.

And the question being put on the amendment to the main motion, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 3)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,
Alexander,
Alkenbrack,
Asselin,
Baldwin,
Barnett,
Beaudoin,
Bell,
Benjamin,
Bigg,
Blackburn,
Brewin,
Broadbent,
Burton,
Cadieu,
Carter,
Coates,
Code,
Crouse,

Danforth,
Dionne,
Douglas,
Fairweather,
Flemming,
Fortin,
Gauthier,
Gilbert,
Godin,
Grills,
Hales,
Harding,
Hees,
Hellyer,
Howard (Skeena),
Howe,
Knight,
Knowles (Winnipeg
North Centre),

Korchinski,
Lambert
(Edmonton West),
Laprise,
La Salle,
Latulippe,
Lewis,
MacDonald
(Egmont),
MacInnis (Cape
Breton-East
Richmond),
MacInnis (Mrs.),
MacKay,
MacLean,
Macquarrie,
MacRae,
McCleave,
McCutcheon,

McGrath,
McIntosh,
McKinley,
McQuaid,
Marshall,
Mather,
Matte,
Moore,
Muir,
Murta,
Nesbitt,
Noble,
Nowlan,
Nystrom,
Orlikow,
Peddle,
Peters,
Ritchie,

Rodrigue,
Rondeau,
Rose,
Rowland,
Rynard,
Saltsman,
Schumacher,
Simpson,
Skoberg,
Southam,
Stewart
(Marquette),
Tétrault,
Thomas
(Moncton),
Winch,
Woolliams,
Yewchuk—86.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,
Andras,
Badanai,
Barrett,
Basford,
Béchar, d,
Beer,
Benson,
Blair,
Blouin,
Boulanger,
Caccia,
Cafik,
Cantin,
Chappell,
Chrétien,
Clermont,
Cobbe,
Comtois,
Corbin,
Crossman,
Cullen,
Cyr,
Danson,
Davis,
Deachman,
Deakon,
De Bané,

Drury,
Dubé,
Dupras,
Émard,
Éthier,
Faulkner,
Forest,
Forget,
Foster,
Francis,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gibson,
Goode,
Goyer,
Gray,
Groos,
Guay (St. Boniface),
Guay (Lévis),
Guilbault,
Haidasz,
Hopkins,
Howard (Okanagan
Boundary),
Hymmen,
Isabelle,
Jamieson,

Jerome,
Kaplan,
Lachance,
Laflamme,
Laing
(Vancouver South),
Lajoie,
Lang (Saskatoon-
Humboldt),
Langlois,
Laniel,
Leblanc (Laurier),
LeBlanc (Rimouski),
Lefebvre,
Legault,
Lessard (LaSalle),
Lessard
(Lac-Saint-Jean),
L'Heureux,
Loiselle,
Macdonald
(Rosedale),
MacEachen,
MacGuigan,
McIlraith,
McNulty,
Mahoney,

Marceau,
Marchand
(Langelier),
Marchand
(Kamloops-
Cariboo),
Noël,
O'Connell,
Olson,
Osler,
Otto,
Ouellet,
Pelletier,
Penner,
Pepin,
Perrault,
Portelance,
Pringle,
Prud'homme,
Richardson,
Robinson,
Rochon,
Rock,
Roy (Timmins),
Roy (Laval),
Serré,
Sharp,

Smith
(Northumberland-
Miramichi),
Smith
(Saint-Jean),
Stafford,
Stanbury,
Stewart (Okanagan-
Kootenay),
St. Pierre,
Sulatycky,
Thomas
(Maisonneuve-
Rosemont),
Tolmie,
Trudeau,
Trudel,
Turner
(London East),
Turner (Ottawa-
Carleton),
Wahn,
Watson,
Whelan,
Whicher,
Whiting,
Yanakis—120.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Walker for Mr. Legault on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

At 6.09 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(2).

No. 6

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Pepin, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of a Report dated January, 1972, entitled "A Study Of Marketing In The Canadian Footwear Industry" Volumes 1, 2 and 3. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-4/47.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Whicher, seconded by Mr. Lajoie,—That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada upon whom has been conferred the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Thomas (Moncton), moved in amendment thereto,—That following the words "Houses of Parliament" there be added:

"but we find intolerable the utter failure of this government to bring forward a decisive policy to achieve full employment and the continuing uncertainty and hesitancy in the economy because of the chronic indecisiveness of this government."

And debate arising thereon;

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to "Motions".

On motion of Mr. Sharp, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), it was ordered,—That the White Paper entitled "Defence in the 70s", laid upon the Table September 7, 1971, be referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Whicher, seconded by Mr. Lajoie,—That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada upon whom has been conferred the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

And on the motion of Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Thomas (Moncton), in amendment thereto,—That following the words "Houses of Parliament" there be added:

"but we find intolerable the utter failure of this government to bring forward a decisive policy to achieve full employment and the continuing uncertainty and hesitancy in the economy because of the chronic indecisiveness of this government."

And debate continuing;

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Comtois for Mr. Gibson on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—General Order of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, dated October 28, 1970, amending the Rules of the Supreme Court of Canada, pursuant to section 103(4) of the Supreme Court Act, chapter S-19, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/246.

By Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt),—General Rules and Orders of the Federal Court of Canada, dated December 22, 1970, made by the Judges of the Court, pursuant to section 46(5), of the Federal Court Act, chapter (1), Statutes of Canada, 1970-71-72, together with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1971-270, dated February 9, 1971, approving same. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/404.

By Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt),—Amending Order No. 1, amending the Federal Court Rules, dated July 15, 1971, made by the Judges of the Court, pursuant to section 46(5), of the Federal Court Act, chapter 1, Statutes of Canada, 1970-71-72, together with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1971-2481, dated November 9, 1971, approving same. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/404A.

By Mr. Richardson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Capital Budget of Polymer Corporation Limited for the year ending December 31, 1972, pursuant to section 70(2) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970, together with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1972-147, dated January 27, 1972, approving same.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/209.

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(2).

No. 7

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: May I refer to and invoke a practice which has arisen in recent years with regard to the introduction and first reading of Public Bills. On today's Order Paper there are listed some 149 bills for introduction by private Members. It was not practical or possible for the Chair to review the provisions of each of those bills. May I therefore suggest to the House that we adopt the procedure which was agreed upon in several recent sessions; namely, that we proceed to the introduction and first reading of those bills so that each may be scrutinized between now and its being called for second reading in order to allow the Chair to consider whether there is any defect in such bills in respect of the practices and usages of the House.

I suggest that by unanimous consent all the Public Bills listed for introduction on today's Order Paper be deemed to have been introduced, given first reading, ordered to be printed and to stand for second reading at the next sitting of the House subject of course to a subsequent examination as to the regularity of each bill. Is the procedure to which I have referred agreed to by the House? Agreed.

Accordingly, by unanimous consent, the following bills were deemed to have been introduced, read the first

time and ordered to be printed, and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House:

Bill C-9, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (abolition of corporal punishment).—*Mr. MacDonald* (Egmont).

Bill C-10, An Act to restrain the use of tobacco.—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act.—*Mr. Anderson*.

Bill C-12, An Act to provide for the establishment of an Environment Council of Canada.—*Mr. Goode*.

Bill C-13, An Act to amend the Combines Investigation Act (floor penalties, criminal joint tortfeasors, and moieties).—*Mr. Orlikow*.

Bill C-14, An Act respecting boating safety.—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-15, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (publication of the result of opinion polls).—*Mr. Coates*.

Bill C-16, An Act to amend the Blue Water Bridge Authority Act (public and financial accountability).—*Mr. McCutcheon*.

Bill C-17, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Act (seat belts).—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-18, An Act to amend the Canadian Citizenship Act.—*Mr. Allmand*.

Bill C-19, An Act respecting employment with the Government of Canada not covered by the Public Service Employment Act.—*Mr. Orlikow*.

Bill C-20, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (attempt to commit suicide).—*Mr. Watson*.

Bill C-21, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (provision for ten general holidays with pay).—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-22, An Act to amend the Criminal Records Act.—*Mr. Robinson*.

Bill C-23, An Act to amend the Immigration Appeal Board Act.—*Mr. Haidasz*.

Bill C-24, An Act to establish a Commuter Passenger Train Authority (Ontario).—*Mr. Roberts*.

Bill C-25, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (proxy voting).—*Mr. Horner*.

Bill C-26, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act (cigarette advertising).—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-27, An Act to amend the Indian Act.—*Mr. Foster*.

Bill C-28, An Act to amend the Bank of Canada Act (braille denomination).—*Mr. Ricard*.

Bill C-29, An Act to amend the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Act.—*Mr. Thomas* (Moncton).

Bill C-30, An Act to amend the Department of Justice Act (annual report).—*Mr. Fortin*.

Bill C-31, An Act to designate Major's Hill Park.—*Mr. Stewart* (Cochrane).

Bill C-32, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (pollution).—*Mr. Anderson*.

Bill C-33, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (proxy voting).—*Mr. Kaplan*.

Bill C-34, An Act respecting packaged perishable food.—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-35, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (preventive detention).—*Mr. Orlikow*.

Bill C-36, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (control of weapons and firearms).—*Mr. Allmand*.

Bill C-37, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (air piracy).—*Mr. Robinson*.

Bill C-38, An Act respecting the disclosure of financial interests by Senators, Members of the House of Commons and certain other persons.—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-39, An Act respecting noise in factories.—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-40, An Act to amend the Department of the Environment Act (fisheries).—*Mr. McGrath*.

Bill C-41, An Act to amend the Fisheries Act (licensing).—*Mr. Barnett*.

Bill C-42, An Act to provide for the protection of news sources (press privilege).—*Mr. Peters*.

Bill C-43, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (vagranacy).—*Mr. Robinson*.

Bill C-44, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act (section 239).—*Mr. Lambert* (Edmonton West).

Bill C-45, An Act to establish a Newfoundland Crossing Authority.—*Mr. Marshall*.

Bill C-46, An Act respecting the presence of the National Flag of Canada in both Houses of Parliament.—*Mr. Stewart* (Cochrane).

Bill C-47, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (publication of straw poll results).—*Mr. Peters*.

Bill C-48, An Act to amend the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act (charity versus closed-shop union dues).—*Mr. Lambert* (Edmonton West).

Bill C-49, An Act to amend the Department of Regional Economic Expansion Act.—*Mr. MacDonald* (Egmont).

Bill C-50, An Act to amend the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.—*Mr. Lambert* (Edmonton West).

Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (air piracy).—*Mr. Woolliams*.

Bill C-52, An Act to establish the Office of Parliamentary Commissioner.—*Mr. Thompson* (Red Deer).

Bill C-53, An Act respecting the designation of Rideau Hall and Government House as Rideau Palace.—*Mr. McBride*.

Bill C-54, An Act respecting Members of the House of Commons as directors of Crown corporations.—*Mr. Stewart* (Cochrane).

Bill C-55, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.—*Mr. Whelan*.

Bill C-56, An Act to amend the Department of Transport Act.—*Mr. Orlikow*.

Bill C-57, An Act to amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act.—*Mr. Robinson*.

Bill C-58, An Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act.—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-59, An Act to amend the Regional Development Incentives Act (economic/social factors).—*Mr. MacDonald* (Egmont).

Bill C-60, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (alteration of odometer).—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-61, An Act to amend the Statistics Act (area statistics).—*Mr. MacDonald* (Egmont).

Bill C-62, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (company-censored housing).—*Mr. Orlikow*.

Bill C-63, An Act to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965, with respect to the quorum of the House of Commons.—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-64, An Act respecting Canada Day.—*Mr. Gibson*.

Bill C-65, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act (advertising on children's programs).—*Mr. McGrath*.

Bill C-66, An Act to amend the Canadian Citizenship Act.—*Mr. Broadbent*.

Bill C-67, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (disturbance in Parliament).—*Mr. Stewart* (Cochrane).

Bill C-68, An Act respecting the protection of endangered species.—*Mr. Watson*.

Bill C-69, An Act to amend the Divorce Act.—*Mr. McCleave*.

Bill C-70, An Act to provide for the establishment of the Alaska-Yukon Highway Authority (Alaska Highway).—*Mr. Thompson* (Red Deer).

Bill C-71, An Act to amend the British North America Act, 1867 (abolition of the Senate).—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-72, An Act respecting disclosure of names of drug addicts.—*Mr. Haidasz*.

Bill C-73, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act.—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-74, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.—*Mr. Deakon*.

Bill C-75, An Act to prevent the invasion of privacy resulting from the misuse of information stored in data banks.—*Mr. Goode*.

Bill C-76, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (abortion).—*Mrs. MacInnis*.

Bill C-77, An Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (labelling).—*Mr. Anderson*.

Bill C-78, An Act respecting the use of the expression "Parliament Hill".—*Mr. McIlraith*.

Bill C-79, An Act concerning the exportation of the growth and produce of Canada.—*Mr. Peters*.

Bill C-80, An Act to amend the Canada Evidence Act (incriminating statements).—*Mr. Orlikow*.

Bill C-81, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (three weeks annual vacation after three years).—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-82, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Act (bumpers).—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-83, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (wire tapping, etc.).—*Mr. Orlikow*.

Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Holidays Act (Victoria Day).—*Mr. Scott*.

Bill C-85, An Act to provide for the constitution of a Federal Transport Commission of Inquiry (impartial investigation of transport accidents).—*Mr. Forrestall*.

Bill C-86, An Act to amend the Financial Administration Act (Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration).—*Mr. Thompson* (Red Deer).

Bill C-87, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (election expenses).—*Mr. Roberts*.

Bill C-88, An Act to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act (St. Luke 11:46).—*Mr. Anderson*.

Bill C-89, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (increased minimum hourly wage).—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-90, An Act to encourage the recycling of post-consumer waste (paper).—*Mr. Goode*.

Bill C-91, An Act respecting the disclosure of financial interests by Senators and Members of the House of Commons.—*Mr. Roberts*.

Bill C-92, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.—*Mr. Hopkins*.

Bill C-93, An Act to amend the International River Improvements Act.—*Mr. Goode*.

Bill C-94, An Act respecting the International Airport at Vancouver.—*Mr. Goode*.

Bill C-95, An Act to amend the Canadian Citizenship Act (freedom of conscience).—*Mr. Peters*.

Bill C-96, An Act to amend the Adult Occupational Training Act.—*Mrs. MacInnis*.

Bill C-97, An Act to amend the Public Service Staff Relations Act.—*Mr. Allmand*.

Bill C-98, An Act to better assure the public's rights to freedom of access to public documents and information about government administration (administrative disclosure).—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-99, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (fair employment practices).—*Mr. Allmand*.

Bill C-100, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (age or sex discrimination).—*Mr. Forrestall*.

Bill C-101, An Act respecting the designation of the Speaker of the House of Commons as the Member for the Electoral District of Parliament Hill.—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-102, An Act respecting Sir John A. Macdonald Day.—*Mr. Macquarrie*.

Bill C-103, An Act to amend the Canadian Citizenship Act (time off without loss of pay for appearance in Citizenship Court).—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-104, An Act respecting disclosure of credit rating records.—*Mr. McGrath*.

Bill C-105, An Act respecting Human Rights.—*Mrs. MacInnis*.

Bill C-106, An Act respecting supersonic aircraft.—*Mr. St. Pierre*.

Bill C-107, An Act to amend the National Defence Act (aid of the civil power).—*Mr. Orlikow*.

Bill C-108, An Act respecting the hunting and fishing rights of Indian Canadians.—*Mr. Simpson*.

Bill C-109, An Act respecting air transportation employees in the Northwest Territories.—*Mr. Orange*.

Bill C-110, An Act respecting the protection of children from poisonous household substances.—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-111, An Act respecting the continental shelf.—*Mr. McGrath*.

Bill C-112, An Act to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965 (duration of House of Commons).—*Mr. Peters*.

Bill C-113, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (cruelty to animals).—*Mr. Mather*.

Bill C-114, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (severance pay).—*Mr. Peters*.

Bill C-115, An Act to amend the Public Service Employment Act (age discrimination).—*Mr. Forrestall*.

Bill C-116, An Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (labelling of dates on perishable commodities).—*Mr. MacDonald* (Egmont).

Bill C-117, An Act to amend the British North America Act, 1867 (National Capital of Canada).—*Mr. Isabelle*.

Bill C-118, An Act respecting the right of the public to information concerning the public business.—*Mr. Baldwin.*

Bill C-119, An Act respecting the establishment and administration of a fund for the mutual aid of children and older persons (foster grandparents).—*Mr. Ryan.*

Bill C-120, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (battered child).—*Mr. Southam.*

Bill C-121, An Act respecting the control of lobbying.—*Mr. Mather.*

Bill C-122, An Act to amend the National Housing Act (municipal water and soil pollution projects).—*Mr. Alexander.*

Bill C-123, An Act to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965 (duration of House of Commons).—*Mr. Rowland.*

Bill C-124, An Act to amend the Indian Act (rights of Indian woman upon marriage).—*Mr. Rock.*

Bill C-125, An Act respecting tar and nicotine content in cigarettes.—*Mr. Robinson.*

Bill C-126, An Act to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965 (Yukon and N.W.T. Senate Representation).—*Mr. Nielsen.*

Bill C-127, An Act to amend the Public Service Employment Act (political partisanship).—*Mr. Burton.*

Bill C-128, An Act to better assure the public's right to freedom of access to public documents and information about government administration.—*Mr. Roberts.*

Bill C-129, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Pension Plan (reduction in qualifying age).—*Mr. Allmand.*

Bill C-130, An Act to provide for the protection of news sources (press privilege).—*Mr. Fairweather.*

Bill C-131, An Act respecting the protection of records of Canadian Business Concerns.—*Mr. Mather.*

Bill C-132, An Act Proclaiming the Canadian Flag Day a National Holiday.—*Mr. Haidasz.*

Bill C-133, An Act to amend the Railway Act (reduction in passenger service).—*Mr. Allmand.*

Bill C-134, An Act respecting the race and national origin of Canadians.—*Mr. Downey.*

Bill C-135, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (young offenders).—*Mr. Woolliams.*

Bill C-136, An Act to amend the Immigration Act (mental retardation).—*Mr. Mather.*

Bill C-137, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (air and water pollution).—*Mr. Allmand.*

Bill C-138, An Act respecting rate fares for disabled persons on federal modes of transport (free or reduced rates).—*Mr. Nesbitt.*

Bill C-139, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (kidnapping).—*Mr. Caouette.*

Bill C-140, An Act to amend the Public Service Staff Relations Act.—*Mr. Orlikow.*

Bill C-141, An Act to amend the Financial Administration Act (Public Accounts).—*Mr. Hales.*

Bill C-142, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (obliteration of motor vehicle serial numbers).—*Mr. Mather.*

Bill C-143, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (adjournment for accused to obtain legal representation).—*Mr. Allmand.*

Bill C-144, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (attempted suicide).—*Mr. Forrestall.*

Bill C-145, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act (equal time to opposition parties).—*Mr. Orlikow.*

Bill C-146, An Act respecting the labelling of hazardous household products.—*Mr. Mather.*

Bill C-147, An Act respecting the labelling of detergents and cleaning agents containing phosphate compounds.—*Mrs. MacInnis.*

Bill C-148, An Act respecting Canada Day.—*Mr. Broadbent.*

Bill C-149, An Act to amend the Inquiries Act (publication of reports).—*Mr. Alexander.*

Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Supreme Court Act (judicial office).—*Mr. McCleave.*

Bill C-151, An Act respecting Conservation Day.—*Mr. Sulatycky.*

Bill C-152, An Act respecting tobacco as a health hazard.—*Mr. Robinson.*

Bill C-153, An Act to amend the War Measures Act.—*Mr. Orlikow.*

Bill C-154, An Act to amend the Canada Corporations Act (not agents of Her Majesty).—*Mr. Fortin.*

Bill C-155, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (attempted suicide).—*Mr. Robinson.*

Bill C-156, An Act to amend the Indian Act.—*Mr. St. Pierre.*

Bill C-157, An Act to amend the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act.—*Mr. Howard (Skeena).*

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Whicher, seconded by Mr. Lajoie,—That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada upon whom has been conferred the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency

for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

And on the motion of Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Thomas (Moncton), in amendment thereto,—That following the words "Houses of Parliament" there be added:

"but we find intolerable the utter failure of this government to bring forward a decisive policy to achieve full employment and the continuing uncertainty and

hesitancy in the economy because of the chronic indecisiveness of this government."

And debate continuing;

By unanimous consent, at 4.57 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until Monday at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(2).

Date	Description
1/1/2020	Initial deposit of \$10,000.00
1/15/2020	Withdrawal of \$5,000.00
2/1/2020	Deposit of \$2,500.00
2/15/2020	Withdrawal of \$1,000.00
3/1/2020	Deposit of \$7,500.00
3/15/2020	Withdrawal of \$3,000.00
3/31/2020	Balance of \$11,500.00

No. 8

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Pursuant to Standing Order 59, on motion of Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Sharp, it was ordered,—That the Estimates of sums required for the service of Canada for the year ending March 31, 1973 be referred to the several Standing Committees of the House, as follows:

To the Standing Committee on Agriculture

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25 relating to the Department of Agriculture.

Vote 30 relating to the Canadian Dairy Commission.

Votes 35 and 40 relating to the Canadian Livestock Feed Board.

Vote 45 relating to the Farm Credit Corporation.

To the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35 and 40 relating to the Department of the Secretary of State.

Vote 45 relating to the Canada Council.

Votes 50 and L55 relating to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Vote 60 relating to the Canadian Radio-Television Commission.

Vote 65 relating to the Company of Young Canadians.

Vote 70 relating to the National Arts Centre Corporation.

Votes 75 and L80 relating to the National Film Board.

Vote 85 relating to the National Library.

Vote 90 relating to the National Museums of Canada.

Votes 95 and L100 relating to the Public Archives.

Vote 25 relating to Information Canada.

To the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence

Votes 1, 5, 10, L15 and 20 relating to the Department of External Affairs.

Votes 25, 30, L35, L40 and L45 relating to the Canadian International Development Agency.

Vote 50 relating to the International Joint Commission.

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30 relating to the Department of National Defence.

Vote 35 relating to Defence Construction (1951) Limited.

To the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs

Votes 1, 5 and 10 relating to the Department of Finance.

Vote 20 relating to the Department of Insurance.

Vote 25 relating to the Tariff Board.

Votes 1, 5, 10, L15, 20, 25, 30 and L35 relating to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Vote 40 relating to the Standards Council of Canada.

Vote 45 relating to Statistics Canada.

Vote 20 relating to the Economic Council of Canada.
Votes 1 and 5 relating to the Department of National Revenue.

To the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25 relating to the Department of the Environment.

To the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15 and 20 relating to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Vote 25 relating to the Prices and Incomes Commission.

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 and 45 relating to the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Votes 50 and 55 relating to the Medical Research Council.

Votes 1 and 5 relating to the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs.

Votes 10 and L15 relating to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Votes 20, 25 and L30 relating to the National Capital Commission.

To the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development

Votes 1, 5, 10, L15, L16, 20, 25, 30, L35, L40, L45, L50, L55, L60, 65, 70 and 75 relating to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Vote L80 relating to the Northern Canada Power Commission.

To the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works

Votes 1, 5, L10 and 15 relating to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Votes 20 and 25 relating to the Atomic Energy Control Board.

Votes 30, 35, L40, L45 and L50 relating to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited.

Vote L55 relating to Eldorado Nuclear Limited.

Vote 60 relating to the National Energy Board.

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, L30, 35 and 40 relating to the Department of Public Works.

To the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs

Vote 1 relating to the Department of Justice.

Vote 5 relating to the Law Reform Commission of Canada.

Vote 10 relating to the Tax Review Board.

Vote 1 relating to the Department of the Solicitor General.

Votes 5, 10 and 15 relating to Correctional Services.

Votes 20 and 25 relating to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

To the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration

Vote 1 relating to the Department of Labour.

Vote 5 relating to the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15 and 20 relating to the Department of Manpower and Immigration.

Vote 25 relating to the Immigration Appeal Board.

To the Standing Committee on Regional Development

Votes 1, 5, 10, L15, L20, L25 and L30 relating to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

Votes 35, 40 and 45 relating to the Cape Breton Development Corporation.

To the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications

Votes 1 and 5 relating to the Department of Communications.

Vote L10 relating to the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation.

Votes 1 and 5 relating to the Post Office.

Votes 1, 5, 10, L15, 20, 25, 30, L35, 40, 45, 50, 55 and 60 relating to the Department of Transport.

Vote 65 relating to the Atlantic Pilotage Authority.

Vote 70 relating to the Canadian National Railways.

Votes 75 and 80 relating to the Canadian Transport Commission.

Vote 85 relating to the Great Lakes Pilotage Authority.

Vote 90 relating to the Laurentian Pilotage Authority.

Votes 95, 100 and L105 relating to the National Harbours Board.

Vote L110 relating to Northern Transportation Company Limited.

Vote 115 relating to the Pacific Pilotage Authority.

Votes 120, L125 and 130 relating to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority.

To the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections

Vote 10 relating to the Chief Electoral Officer.

To the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50 and 55 relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

To the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates

Vote 15 relating to the Auditor General.

Vote 1 relating to the Governor General and Lieutenant Governors.

Votes 1 and 5 relating to the Privy Council Office.

Vote 15 relating to the Commissioner of Official Languages.

Vote 25 relating to the Public Service Staff Relations Board.

Vote 1 relating to the Ministry of State for Science and Technology.

Vote 5 relating to the Science Council of Canada.

Vote 105 relating to the Public Service Commission.

Votes 1, 5 and 10 relating to the Department of Supply and Services.

Vote 15 relating to Canadian Arsenal Limited.

Vote 20 relating to the Canadian Commercial Corporation.

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15 and 20 relating to the Treasury Board.

Votes 25, 30 and 35 relating to the National Research Council of Canada.

To the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization

Vote 1 relating to the Senate.

Vote 5 relating to the House of Commons.

Vote 10 relating to the Library of Parliament.

Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Report to the House of Commons on the sale of wheat to the U.S.S.R. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/142.

Mr. Pelletier, seconded by Mr. Olson, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-158, An Act respecting the national anthem of Canada, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Whicher, seconded by Mr. Lajoie,—That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada upon whom has been conferred the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

And on the motion of Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Thomas (Moncton), in amendment thereto,—That following the words "Houses of Parliament" there be added: "but we find intolerable the utter failure of this government to bring forward a decisive policy to achieve full employment and the continuing uncertainty and hesitancy in the economy because of the chronic indecisiveness of this government."

And debate continuing; at 9.30 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker interrupted the proceedings pursuant to Special Order made Wednesday, February 23, 1972;

And the question being put on the said proposed amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 4)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,
Alkenbrack,
Asselin,
Barnett,
Bell,
Benjamin,
Bigg,
Blackburn,
Brewin,
Burton,
Crouse,
Danforth,
Dinsdale,
Dionne,
Flemming,
Forrestall,
Gilbert,
Gleave,
Godin,
Grills,
Hales,
Harding,
Harkness,
Hees,
Howe,
Knight,
Knowles (Winnipeg
North Centre),
Korchinski,
Laprise,
La Salle,
Lundrigan,

MacDonald
(Egmont),
MacInnis (Cape
Breton-East
Richmond),
MacKay,
MacLean,
Macquarrie,
MacRae,
McCleave,
McCutcheon,
McGrath,
McQuaid,
Mather,
Moore,
Muir,

Murta,
Nesbitt,
Nielsen,
Noble,
Nowlan,
Nystrom,
Orlikow,
Paproski,
Peddle,
Peters,
Ricard,
Ritchie,
Rodrigue,
Rondeau,
Rose,
Ryan,

Rynard,
Saltsman,
Scott,
Simpson,
Skoberg,
Skoreyko,
Southam,
Stanfield,
Stewart
(Marquette),
Thompson
(Red Deer),
Thomson
(Battleford-
Kindersley),
Woolliams—72.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,
Badanai,
Barrett,
Basford,
Béchar,de,
Beer,
Benson,
Blouin,
Borrie,
Boulanger,
Caccia,
Cafik,
Cantin,
Clermont,
Cobbe,
Comtois,

Corbin,
Corriveau,
Crossman,
Cullen,
Cyr,
Danson,
Davis,
Deachman,

De Bané,
Drury,
Dubé,
Dupras,
Duquet,
Éthier,
Faulkner,
Forest,

Forget,
Foster,
Francis,
Gendron,
Gillespie,
Goode,
Goyer,
Gray,

Groos,	Lajoie,	McBride,	Perrault,	St. Pierre,
Guay	Lang (Saskatoon-	McIlraith,	Portelance,	Sulatycky,
(St. Boniface),	Humboldt),	McNulty,	Pringle,	Thomas
Guay (Lévis),	Langlois,	Mahoney,	Reid,	(Maisonneuve-
Haidasz,	Laniel,	Marceau,	Richardson,	Rosemont),
Hogarth,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Marchand	Rochon,	Tolmie,
Hopkins,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	(Langelier),	Rock,	Trudeau,
Howard (Okanagan	Lefebvre,	Marchand	Roy (Laval),	Trudel,
Boundary),	Legault,	(Kamloops-	Serré,	Turner
Hymmen,	Lessard (LaSalle),	Cariboo),	Sharp,	(London East),
Isabelle,	Lessard	Munro,	Smith	Wahn,
Jerome,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Murphy,	(Northumberland-	Walker,
Kaplan,	L'Heureux,	Noël,	Miramichi),	Watson,
Lachance,	Lind,	O'Connell,	Smith	Weatherhead,
Lafamme,	Loiselle,	Osler,	(Saint-Jean),	Whelan,
Laing	MacEachen,	Ouellet,	Stafford,	Whicher,
(Vancouver South),	MacGuigan,	Pelletier,	Stewart (Okanagan-	Yanakis—111.
			Kootenay),	

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Rochon for Mr. Langlois on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Caccia for Mr. Smith (Saint-Jean) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Francis for Mr. Énard on the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Speaker,—Report of the Proceedings of the Commissioners of Internal Economy, for the period November 4, 1970 to December 15, 1971, pursuant to Standing Order 78. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/2.

By unanimous consent, at 9.55 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(2).

No. 9

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Skoberg, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-159, An Act respecting the safe haulage of loose materials, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Skoberg, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-160, An Act to amend the Railway Act (notice of accidents), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Badanai, seconded by Mr. McIlraith, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-161, An Act respecting the control of excessive outdoor noises, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Whicher, seconded by Mr. Lajoie,—That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada upon whom has been conferred the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

And debate continuing;

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to "Motions".

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Gillespie, it was resolved,—That a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons be appointed to examine and report upon proposals, made public, or which are from time to time made public by the Government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitu-

tion of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the Provinces in February, 1968, and alternative proposals on the same subjects;

That the Committee have power to appoint, from among its members, such sub-committees as it may deem advisable or necessary;

That the Committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House of Commons;

That the Committee have power to report from time to time, to send for persons, papers, and records, and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the Committee;

That the quorum of the Committee be 17 members, whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as both Houses are represented and that the Joint Chairmen be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, when 7 members are present so long as both Houses are represented;

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject in the Second and Third Sessions be referred to the Committee and made part of the records thereof;

That the following Members be appointed to act on behalf of the House of Commons on the Special Joint Committee, namely: Messrs. Alexander, Allmand, Asselin, Breau, Brewin, De Bané, Dinsdale, Fairweather, Gibson, Gundlock, Hogarth, Lachance, Laprise, MacGuigan, Marcéau, Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo), McQuaid, Osler, Prud'homme and Rowland.

And that a Message be sent to the Senate requesting Their Honours to unite with this House for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems so advisable, some of its members to act on the proposed joint committee.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Whicher, seconded by Mr. Lajoie,—That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada upon whom has been conferred the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

On motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), it was ordered,—That the Address be engrossed and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by Mr. Speaker.

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, on motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), it was ordered,—That this House at its next sitting consider the business of Supply.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Crossman, Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean) and Beer for Messrs. Cantin, Côté (Richelieu) and Lefebvre on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Ouellet, Rochon, Weatherhead and Tolmie for Messrs. Guilbault, Langlois, Major and Orange on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Trudel for Mr. Cullen on the Standing Committee on Labor, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Benjamin for Mr. Blackburn on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Legault for Mr. Weatherhead on the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Messrs. Lajoie, Gibson, Sulatycky and Goode for Messrs. Côté (Richelieu), Deakon, Morison and Orange on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Messrs. Allmand, Clermont and Turner (London East) for Messrs. Weatherhead, Ouellet and Tolmie on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Messrs. Howard (Okanagan Boundary) and Buchanan for Messrs. Noël and Rochon on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

At 9.50 o'clock p.m., on motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 10

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

The Clerk of the House laid on the Table the following Private Bill:

Bill C-164, An Act to incorporate United Bank of Canada.—*Mr. Haidasz.*

The said Bill was deemed to have been read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House, pursuant to Standing Order 100(1).

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk of the House had laid upon the Table the Second Report of the Clerk of Petitions, which is as follows:

The Clerk of Petitions has the honour to report that he has examined the petition of Chief Charlie Abel, Abraham Peter, Band Councillor; Edith Josie, Band Councillor; John Kendi, Band Councillor; Lazarus Charlie, Band Councillor; members of the aboriginal people of the Old Crow Indians in the Yukon Territory, and pertaining to the aboriginal rights of the people of the Old Crow to their ancient tribal territories, presented on February 29, 1972, and finds that it meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That the said petition be printed as an appendix to this day's *Hansard*.

24960—3j

Mr. Macdonald, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copy of Agreement between the Governments of Canada and the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick with respect to the establishment of a Review Board to reassess the economic feasibility of developing power from the tides of the Bay of Fundy. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-5/50.

Mr. O'Connell, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Document entitled "Canadian position with respect to Conventions and Recommendations adopted at the 53rd and 54th Sessions of the International Labour Conference, Geneva, June 1969 and June 1970". (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/20.

Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley), seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-162, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (retirement plan), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley), seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-163, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (pension on permanent closing), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following four Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 70—*Mr. McCleave*

1. What shipments of commodities, equipment, food and international emergency relief were made by the Canadian International Development Agency during 1971?

2. From what ports or airports were such shipments made?

3. Which brokers arranged the shipments?

4. What vessels or other transportation means were used on the hauls out of Canada?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/70.

No. 90—*Mr. Nesbitt*

1. Were any duties or taxes levied on the earnings of foreign spray aircraft engaged in Bertha Army worm control in western Canada last August and, if so, what was the number of foreign aircraft paying taxes or duties?

2. What were the names of the owners and/or operators of the foreign aircraft referred to in Part 1?

3. What were the foreign registration markings on these aircraft?

4. Were any foreign non-duty paid aircraft operated commercially on this project?

5. Did the following United States registered aircraft (a) N996X (b) N5251 (c) N8665L (d) N8668L (e) N8556L (f) N7257V participate in the Bertha Army worm project in Saskatchewan and, if so, were they duty paid?

6. Were any duties received from a Mr. Beattie of Tisdale, Saskatchewan on behalf of Singleton Flying Service of Port Pierre, South Dakota?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/90.

No. 116—*Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse)*

1. Is the thread used in the production of textiles in Canada manufactured in Canada and, if so, what are the names and addresses of the manufacturers?

2. Are these companies capable of manufacturing sufficient amounts of thread to meet the needs of Canadian textile plants?

3. During each of the past three years, did any companies obtain grants from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion or Industry, Trade and Commerce and, if so, which companies?

4. During each of the past three years, did any Canadian companies import thread for the manufacture of their products and, if so (a) from what countries (b) in what quantities (c) at what cost?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/116.

No. 155—*Mr. MacDonald (Egmont)*

1. What defence commodities were purchased from Canada in the years 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969 and 1970 by (a) Brazil (b) Burma (c) Pakistan (d) Portugal (e) United States (f) Greece (g) Republic of South Africa (h) Spain?

2. How does the government determine on a continuing basis that defence commodities are not resold to other countries, organizations and individuals?

3. What penalties are invoked for the violation of such resale agreements?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/155.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Resolved,—That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada relating to the Nelson River Power Project to date during 1971.—(Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 7—*Mr. Faulkner*).

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act;

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to "Motions".

Mr. Pelletier, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Tables showing (1) Post-secondary Education Operating Expenditures, 1967-1972. (2) Total value of Transfer (a) to Provinces 1967-1972. (3) Value of Tax Abatement and Equalization Payments 1967-1972. (4) Value of Cash Adjustment Payments 1967-1972 in connection with the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, 1967 (Part II). (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-5/51.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That the said Tables be printed as an appendix to this day's *Hansard*.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Whicher for Mr. Mahoney on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Penner for Mr. Trudel on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Horner, Alkenbrack and Korchinski for Messrs. Moore, Murta and Nowlan on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Serré and Smith (Saint-Jean) for Messrs. Murphy and Prud'homme on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Davis, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, —Report of the Eastern Rockies Forest Conservation Board, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 10 of the Eastern Rocky Mountain Forest Conservation Act, chapter 59, Statutes of Canada, 1947. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/124.

By Mr. Davis,—Report of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation for the year ended April 30, 1971, pursuant to section 33 of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act, chapter F-13, R.S.C., 1970, together with accounts and financial statements by the Auditor General. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/294.

By the Examiner of Petitions for Private Bills, First Report, pursuant to Standing Order 97(2), as follows:

The Examiner of Petitions for Private Bills has the honour to report that the following petitioners have complied with the requirements of Standing Order 93:

Isadore Levinter and Benjamin Victor Levinter, both of Woodbridge, in the Regional Municipality of York, Ontario, Zenon Gutkowski, of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, Ontario, Adiuto John Pianosi, of the Town of Copper Cliff, Ontario and Gerald La Salle, of the City of Sherbrooke, Quebec, praying for the passing of an Act incorporating "United Bank of Canada" and, in French, "*Banque Unie du Canada*".

By unanimous consent, at 5.55 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 11

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Jamieson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Letters dated March 1, 1972, exchanged between the Minister of Transport and the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics of the Province of Ontario in relation to the establishment of a major airport in Pickering Township, together with "Annex of Understanding", dated March 1, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-5/135.

Mr. Goyer, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Special Report 1 of the Working Group on Federal Maximum Security Institutions Design, dated November 30, 1971. (Chairman, J. W. Mohr, Esq.). (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-4/48.

Mr. Prud'homme, seconded by Mr. Richard, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-165, An Act to amend the Canadian Citizenship Act (minimum residence requirement), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(*Private Bills*)

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of Bill C-164, An Act to incorporate United Bank of Canada;

Mr. Haidasz, seconded by Mr. Jerome, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred

to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion it was agreed to, on division.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

A Message was received from the Senate as follows:

Ordered,—That the Senate do unite with the House of Commons in the appointment of a Special Joint Committee of both Houses to examine and report upon proposals, made public, or which are from time to time made public by the Government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitution of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the Provinces in February, 1968, and alternative proposals on the same subjects;

That the Committee have power to appoint, from among its members, such sub-committees as it may deem advisable or necessary;

That the Committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the Senate;

That the Committee have power to report from time to time, to send for persons, papers and records, and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the Committee;

That the quorum of the Committee be 17 members, whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as both Houses are represented and that the Joint Chairmen be authorized to hold meetings, to re-

ceive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, when 7 members are present so long as both Houses are represented;

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject in the Second and Third Sessions of the 28th Parliament be referred to the Committee and made part of the records thereof;

That the following Senators be appointed to act on behalf of the Senate on the Special Joint Committee, namely, the Honourable Senators Cameron, Fergusson, Flynn, Forsey, Haig, Lafond, Lamontagne, Molgat, Quart, Yuzyk; and

That a Message be sent to the House of Commons to inform that House accordingly.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk, of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Return to an Address, dated March 1, 1972, to His Excellency the Governor General, for a copy of all correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada relating to the Nelson River Power Project to date during 1971.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 7*).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/7.

By Mr. Stanbury, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Department of Communications for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 6 of the Department of Communications Act, chapter C-24, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/22.

At 10.19 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 12

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Barnett for Mr. Howard (Skeena), seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-166, An Act respecting Indian Lands in the Province of British Columbia, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen, —That Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

[At 4.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Notices of Motions)

By unanimous consent, items numbered one, two, three, four, five, six and seven were allowed to stand and retain their position.

Mr. Godin, seconded by Mr. Latulippe, moved,—That in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of introducing legislative measures so that the income of Canadians will be adjusted to the increasing cost of living by eliminating all taxes for single persons earning less than \$3,000 and for married couples earning less than \$5,000 with the addition of a further \$500 exemption for each dependent child.—(Notice of Motion No. 8).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Prud'homme for Mr. Givens on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Mr. Howard (Skeena) for Mr. Barnett on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Aiken for Mr. Woolliams on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until Monday at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 13

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications of Bill C-4, An Act to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways System and Air Canada for the period from the 1st day of January, 1971, to the 30th day of June, 1972, and to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railway Company and certain debentures to be issued by Air Canada;

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

And debate arising thereon;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to *Standing Order 15(4)*]

(*Notices of Motions*)

Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. McGrath, moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should initiate a national research and development program in

respect of methods of proper and economic solid-waste disposal, including studies directed to the conservation of natural resources by reducing the amount of waste and unsalvageable materials and by recovery and utilization of potential resources in solid wastes; and provide technical and financial assistance to provincial and municipal governments and multi-governmental agencies in the planning, development, and conduct of solid-waste disposal programs.—(*Notion of Motion No. 1*).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for *Private Members' Business* expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-4, An Act to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways System and Air Canada for the period from the 1st day of January, 1971, to the 30th day of June, 1972, and to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railway Company and certain debentures to be issued by Air Canada, be now read a second time and be

referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.11 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. McNulty for Mr. Weatherhead on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Roberts and Breau for Messrs. Morison and Gendron on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. Legault for Mr. Hopkins on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Pepin, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by Command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Report of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce under the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act—Part 1—Corporations—for the year ended December 31, 1969, pursuant to subsection (1) of section 16 of the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act, chapter 26, Statutes of Canada, 1962. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/115.

At 10.35 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 14

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Drury, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor General, which was read by Mr. Speaker, as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General transmits to the House of Commons Supplementary Estimates (B) of sums required for the service of Canada for the year ending on the 31st March, 1972, and, in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867" the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GÉRALD FAUTEUX,
Deputy Governor General.

Government House, Ottawa.

The said Estimates, 1971-72, recorded as Sessional Paper No. 284-1/132A.

Pursuant to Standing Order 59, on motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South) it was ordered,—That the Supplementary Estimates (B), 1971-72, Tabled this day be referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. O'Connell, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by Command of His Excellency the Governor General, laid upon the Table,—Copies of the Annual Report of Information Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/304.

Mr. Lajoie, seconded by Mr. Dupras, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-167, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That speeches on the motion under the order Business of Supply be limited to fifteen minutes with the exception of the mover, the principal speaker on behalf of the government who shall be limited to thirty minutes and the principal speakers of the other opposition parties who shall be limited to twenty minutes.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Baldwin, seconded by Mr. Ricard, moved,— This House condemns the Government for its mismanagement and waste of taxpayers money and urges that Parliament take steps to exercise greater scrutiny and control over estimates and expenditures.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mr. Peters, moved in amendment thereto,—That the motion be amended by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"by amending the Standing Orders of the House of Commons so that the handling of estimates, instead of being perfunctory and ineffective, will be put on a proper basis, including provision for adequate committee time, space and services, and for consideration of certain of the estimates on the floor of the House of Commons."

After debate thereon, at 9.45 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker interrupted the debate pursuant to Standing Order 58(9);

And the question being put on the said proposed amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 5)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander,
Asselin,
Baldwin,
Beaudoin,
Bell,
Benjamin,
Blackburn,
Brewin,
Broadbent,
Burton,
Cadieu,
Caouette,
Carter,
Code,
Comeau,
Crouse,
Dinsdale,
Douglas,

Downey,
Flemming,
Forrestall,
Fortin,
Gauthier,
Gilbert,
Gleave,
Godin,
Harding,
Harkness,
Hees,
Horner,
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand),
Lambert
(Edmonton West),

Latulippe,
Lundrigan,
MacDonald
(Egmont),
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond),
MacInnis (Mrs.),
MacKay,
MacLean,
Macquarrie,
MacRae,
McCleave,
McCutcheon,
McGrath,
McKinley,
McQuaid,
Marshall,

Mather,
Matte,
Mazankowski,
Muir,
Nielsen,
Nowlan,
Orlikow,
Paproski,
Peddle,
Peters,
Ricard,
Ritchie,
Rodrigue,
Rondeau,
Rowland,
Rynard,
Saltsman,
Schumacher,

Scott,
Simpson,
Skoberg,
Skoreyko,
Southam,
Stewart
(Marquette),
Tétrault,
Thomas
(Moncton),
Thomson
(Battleford-Kindersley),
Valade,
Winch,
Woolliams,
Yewchuk—79.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,
Andras,
Badanai,
Barrett,
Basford,
Béchar,
Beer,
Blair,
Blouin,
Borrie,
Boulanger,
Breau,
Buchanan,
Caccia,
Cantin,
Clermont,
Cobbe,
Comtois,
Corbin,
Côté (Richelieu),
Côté (Longueuil),
Cullen,
Cyr,
Davis,
Deachman,
Deakon,

De Bané,
Drury,
Dubé,
Dupras,
Duquet,
Énard,
Forest,
Forget,
Foster,
Francis,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gibson,
Goode,
Goyer,
Gray,
Groos,
Guay (St. Boniface),
Guay (Lévis),
Guilbault,
Haidasz,
Hogarth,
Hopkins,
Howard (Okanagan Boundary),
Hymmen,

Isabelle,
Jamieson,
Jerome,
Kaplan,
Lafamme,
Laing
(Vancouver South),
Lajoie,
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt),
Langlois,
Laniel,
Leblanc (Laurier),
LeBlanc (Rimouski),
Lefebvre,
Legault,
Lessard (LaSalle),
Lessard
(Lac-Saint-Jean),
Lind,
Loiselle,
MacEachen,
MacGuigan,
McIlraith,
McNulty,
Marceau,

Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo),
Murphy,
Noël,
O'Connell,
Osler,
Otto,
Ouellet,
Penner,
Pepin,
Perrault,
Portelance,
Pringle,
Prud'homme,
Reid,
Richard,
Richardson,
Roberts,
Rochon,
Rock,
Roy (Timmins),
Roy (Laval),
Serré,
Sharp,

Smith
(Northumberland-Miramichi),
Smith
(Saint-Jean),
Stafford,
Stanbury,
Stewart
(Cochrane),
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay),
St. Pierre,
Thomas
(Maisonneuve-Rosemont),
Tolmie,
Trudel,
Turner
(London East),
Wahn,
Watson,
Weatherhead,
Whelan,
Whicher,
Whiting—114.

And the question being put on the main motion, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 6)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander,
Asselin,
Baldwin,
Beaudoin,
Bell,
Benjamin,
Blackburn,
Brewin,
Broadbent,
Burton,
Cadieu,
Caouette,
Carter,
Code,
Comeau,
Crouse,
Dinsdale,
Douglas,
Downey,
Flemming,
Forrestall,
Fortin,
Gauthier,
Gilbert,
Gleave,
Godin,
Harding,
Harkness,
Hees,
Horner,
Knowles (Winnipeg
North Centre),
Knowles (Norfolk-
Haldimand),
Lambert
(Edmonton West),

Latulippe,
Lundrigan,
MacDonald
(Egmont),
MacInnis (Cape
Breton-East
Richmond),
MacInnis (Mrs.),
MacKay,
MacLean,
Macquarrie,
MacRae,
McCleave,
McCutcheon,
McGrath,
McKinley,
McQuaid,

Marshall,
Mather,
Matte,
Mazankowski,
Muir,
Nielsen,
Nowlan,
Orlikow,
Paproski,
Peddle,
Peters,
Ricard,
Ritchie,
Rodrigue,
Rondeau,
Rowland,
Rynard,
Saltsman,

Schumacher,
Scott,
Simpson,
Skoberg,
Skoreyko,
Southam,
Stewart
(Marquette),
Tétrault,
Thomas
(Moncton),
Thomson
(Battleford-
Kindersley),
Valade,
Winch,
Woolliams,
Yewchuk—79.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,
Andras,
Badanai,
Barrett,
BASFORD,
Béchar, d,
Beer,
Blair,
Blouin,
Borrie,
Boulanger,
Breau,
Buchanan,
Caccia,
Cantin,
Clermont,
Cobbe,
Comtois,
Corbin,
Côté (Richelieu),
Côté (Longueuil),
Cullen,
Cyr,
Davis,
Deachman,
Deakon,
De Bané,
Drury,
Dubé,
Dupras,
Duquet,
Émard,
Forest,
Forget,
Foster,
Francis,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gibson,
Goode,
Goyer,
Gray,
Groos,
Guay (St. Boniface),
Guay (Lévis),
Guilbault,
Haidasz,
Hogarth,
Hopkins,
Howard (Okanagan
Boundary),

Hymmen,
Isabelle,
Jamieson,
Jerome,
Kaplan,
Lafamme,
Laing
(Vancouver South),
Lajoie,
Lang (Saskatoon-
Humboldt),
Langlois,
Laniel,
Leblanc (Laurier),
LeBlanc (Rimouski),
Lefebvre,
Legault,
Lessard (LaSalle),
Lessard
(Lac-Saint-Jean),
Lind,
Loiselle,
MacEachen,
MacGuigan,
McIlraith,
McNulty,

Marceau,
Marchand
(Kamloops-
Cariboo),
Murphy,
Noël,
O'Connell,
Osler,
Otto,
Ouellet,
Penner,
Pepin,
Perrault,
Portelance,
Pringle,
Prud'homme,
Reid,
Richard,
Richardson,
Roberts,
Rochon,
Rock,
Roy (Timmins),
Roy (Laval),
Serré,

Sharp,
Smith
(Northumberland-
Miramichi),
Smith
(Saint-Jean),
Stafford,
Stanbury,
Stewart
(Cochrane),
Stewart (Okanagan-
Kootenay),
St. Pierre,
Thomas
(Maisonneuve-
Rosemont),
Tolmie,
Trudel,
Turner,
Wahn,
Watson,
Weatherhead,
Whelan,
Whicher,
Whiting—114.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Marshall for Mr. Comeau on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Lind for Mr. Cafik on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Peters for Mr. Nystrom on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Messrs. Badanai, Lessard (LaSalle), Laflamme and Howe for Messrs. Caccia, Corriveau, Sulatycky and Alkenbrack on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. McBride, Cobbe and Whelan for Messrs. Orange, Comtois and Robinson on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Otto for Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary) on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Alkenbrack for Mr. Howe on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Murphy and Guay (Lévis) for Messrs. Guay (St. Boniface) and Morison on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. McCleave for Mr. Muir on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Borrie, Lind, Goode and McNulty for Messrs. Orange, Clermont, Cyr and Sulatycky on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Messrs. Forget, Smith (Saint-Jean), Penner, Trudel and Loiselle for Messrs. Faulkner, LeBlanc (Rimouski), Roy (Timmins), De Bané and Stewart (Cochrane) on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Messrs. Alkenbrack, Peddle and Paproski for Messrs. Danforth, Korchinski and McKinley on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Messrs. Danforth, Korchinski and McKinley for Messrs. Alkenbrack, Peddle and Paproski on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

At 10.13 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 15

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Badanai, seconded by Mr. Winch, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-168, An Act respecting cancer research, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 2, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Interim Report made in March, 1968, by Dr. A. Vennema, Director of Canadian Medical Aid in Vietnam in 1967-68 and for copies of any subsequent correspondence between him and the Department of External Affairs,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 3, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report undertaken in the Department of Agriculture on

the United States Internal Food-Aid Program and its application to Canada,

having been called was, at the request of the honourable Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 6, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all documents, reports, letters, papers and statements in reference to and material to the release of Yves Geoffroy from the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary and material to his wrongful escape, while serving a life sentence for the conviction pertaining to the murder of his wife,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 17, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a description of the area which the federal government would like to see incorporated in the proposed second national park in Saskatchewan to be situated in the Val Marie-Killdeer area,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-4, An Act to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways System and Air Canada for the period from the 1st day of January, 1971, to the 30th day of June, 1972, and to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railway Company and certain debentures to be issued by Air Canada, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

And debate continuing;

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Flemming and Fairweather for Messrs. Hales and MacKay on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Muir for Mr. McCleave on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Orlikow for Mr. Mather on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Alkenbrack, Peddle and Paproski for Messrs. Danforth, Korchinski and McKinley on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Murphy for Mr. Hymmen on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Messrs. Legault, Schumacher and MacDonald (Egmont) for Messrs. Crossman, Peddle and Murta on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Chrétien, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Revised Capital Budget of the Northern Canada Power Commission for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 70(2) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970, together with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1972-192, dated February 3, 1972, approving same. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/198A.

By Mr. Chrétien,—Capital Budget of the Northern Canada Power Commission for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, pursuant to section 70(2) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970, together with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1972-332, dated February 24, 1972, approving same. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/198.

By Mr. Chrétien,—Statement concerning Refunds under The Refunds (Natural Resources) Act, for the period October 5, 1970 to February 16, 1972, pursuant to section 3 of the said Act, chapter 35, Statutes of Canada, 1932. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/225.

By Mr. Chrétien,—List of Apportionments and Adjustments of Seed Grain, Fodder for Animals and Other Relief Indebtedness, for the period from October 5, 1970 to February 16, 1972, pursuant to section 2 of an Act respecting Certain Debts due the Crown, chapter 51, Statutes of Canada, 1926-27. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/237.

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 16

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Notices having been given to Mr. Speaker pursuant to Section (2) of Standing Order 17 with respect to the Tabling of the Report of the Auditor General for the year ended December 31, 1971, and questions of privilege having been raised in relation thereto;

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Lewis, it was ordered,—That the complaint of the Auditor General that the Government has failed to provide him with such officers and employees as are necessary to enable him to perform his duties, as required by Section 56(4) of the Financial Administration Act, and his consequent failure to submit his Report in time, be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, and that the said Committee hear the Auditor General and other witnesses and report its recommendations thereon not later than March 29.

Mr. O'Connell, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of letters dated between November 5 and November 12, 1971, relating to a grant approved under the Local Initiatives Program, with respect to The Process—Church of the Final Judgment. Sessional Paper No. 284-7/3.

Mr. Pepin, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of the Annual Handbook of present conditions and recent progress, entitled "Canada 1972". (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/321A.

Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of correspondence exchanged between the Minister of Finance and the Auditor General of Canada, dated March 7 and 9, 1972, with regard to the Tabling of the Report of the Auditor General of Canada for the year ended December 31, 1971.—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/2.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-4, An Act to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways System and Air Canada for the period from the 1st day of January, 1971, to the 30th day of June, 1972, and to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railway Company and certain debentures to be issued by Air Canada, be now read a second time and be

referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

[*Notices of Motions (Papers)*]

Items numbered 2, 3 and 6 were allowed to stand and retain their position at the request of the government.

Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a description of the area which the federal government would like to see incorporated in the proposed second national park in Saskatchewan to be situated in the Val Marie-Killdeer area.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 17*).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for *Private Members' Business* expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-4, An Act to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways System and Air Canada for the period from the 1st day of January, 1971, to the 30th day of June, 1972, and to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railway Company and certain debentures to be issued by Air Canada, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

And debate continuing;

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Honourable Senators Fergusson, Forsey, Goldenberg, Grosart, Haig, Lafond, Molson and Rowe have been appointed to act on behalf of the Senate on the Standing Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments.

(*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*)

By unanimous consent, at 9.55 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Portelance, Laflamme, Jerome and Roberts for Messrs. Yanakis, Robinson, Goode and Gibson on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Tétrault for Mr. Dionne on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. LeBlanc (Rimouski), Lessard (LaSalle), Comtois and McCutcheon for Messrs. Cullen, Cafik, Leblanc (Laurier) and Flemming on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Noël for Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary) on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Flemming for Mr. McCutcheon on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Messrs. Noël and MacKay for Messrs. Portelance and Flemming on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. Corriveau, Sulatycky and Stewart (Cochrane) for Messrs. Lessard (LaSalle), Laflamme and O'Connell on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. De Bané, Faulkner, LeBlanc (Rimouski), Roy (Timmins) and Stewart (Cochrane) for Messrs. Trudel, Forget, Smith (Saint-Jean), Penner and Loisel on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Mr. Ouellet for Mr. Clermont on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Deakon for Mr. Gibson on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Messrs. Yanakis, Robinson and Gibson for Messrs. Portelance, Laflamme and Roberts on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Messrs. Côté (Richelieu) and Crossman for Messrs. Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean) and Legault on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Robinson for Mr. Whelan on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Messrs. Cafik and Brewin for Messrs. LeBlanc (Rimouski) and Harding on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Macdonald, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Capital Budgets of Eldorado Nuclear Limited and Eldorado Aviation Limited, for the year ending December 31, 1972, pursuant to section 70(2) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970, together with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1972-331, dated February 24, 1972, approving same.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/130.

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copies of Statutory Orders and Regulations published in the *Canada Gazette*, Part II of Wednesday, March 8, 1972, pursuant to section 7 of the Regulations

Act, chapter R-5, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/335.

Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Anti-dumping Tribunal for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 32 of the Anti-dumping Act, chapter A-15, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/282.

At 10.16 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 17

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: Yesterday the Chair received five notices of questions of privilege under Standing Order 17. All five were related to one or another aspect of the Tabling of the Auditor General's report, and to references that had been made in debate to the delay in filing last year's report. In his reply, the President of the Privy Council agreed to sponsor one of the motions and it was unanimously agreed that the matter in dispute would be referred to the Public Accounts Committee. At the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition, the Chair agreed to give further consideration to the other motions although it was pointed out that it would be difficult not to take into account that one of the several methods for proceeding proposed by honourable Members had been agreed to by the whole House. To some extent, at least, consideration of the alternative proposals has to be somewhat theoretical; traditionally, the Chair is reluctant to make procedural rulings in such circumstances. I will therefore be very brief which I hope will not be a reflection on the importance of the matter raised by the honourable Members who presented motions to the Chair under the terms of Standing Order 17.

One of the suggestions made yesterday is that a charge against a senior public servant gives rise to a question of privilege. Honourable Members know that there have been many instances over the years where accusations

or charges have been made in relation to senior public servants. The Chair has never condoned such actions. Indeed, just a few weeks ago, I suggested that a motion under Standing Order 43 was irregular to the extent that it contained charges against the Chairman of the Public Service Commission. It was not my view, however, that the question was one of privilege, but rather one of procedural order. In the matter before us now, I would agree again that it is irregular for any honourable Member to make a charge, directly or indirectly, against a senior public official in the service of the government or of Parliament. I refer honourable Members to citation 152(4) of Beauchesne's Fourth edition, as follows: "All references to judges and courts of justice and to personages of high official station, of the nature of personal attack and censure, have always been considered unparliamentary, and the Speakers of the British and Canadian Houses have always treated them as breaches of order."

The Chair is in full agreement with the citation and I would hope that honourable Members would remember that the practice is based on simple common sense and fair play. Honourable Members will note however that there is no suggestion either in the Beauchesne citation, or anywhere in our precedents, that such breaches of order are tantamount to breaches of privilege.

With respect, I cannot accept the interesting suggestion that parliamentary privilege extends to senior officials, be they senior officials of Parliament or of government.

Privilege, as honourable Members know, is the sum of the special rights enjoyed by Members over and beyond the rights enjoyed by other citizens under the common law. Without going into further detail on the definition of parliamentary privilege, I think it should be noted that it has never been deemed to extend to officials or servants of Parliament.

The second aspect of this question is the interesting proposition advanced by the honourable Member for Peace River that it would be a breach of privilege to impede honourable Members in the discharge of their duties to deny the Auditor General adequate working facilities.

In the course of argument it was indicated that this is not a new complaint but has reference rather to a situation which is alleged to have obtained for some time. This, it seems to me, has to be viewed much more as a matter of administration than as one of parliamentary privilege.

In this respect, the complaint should be considered by way of substantive motion rather than under the guise of privilege. Alternatively, such grievances can be studied by an appropriate committee of the House, which is precisely the action which the House unanimously endorsed yesterday.

For these reasons, I have come to the conclusion that I cannot put this question to the House as one of *prima facie* case of breach of parliamentary privilege. I remind honourable Members that this is not a decision on the substance of the matter but one only of procedure, which is the limit of the Speaker's responsibility in such matters. In this respect, I refer honourable Members to a decision of Mr. Speaker Michener who, having refused to put a motion as one of privilege, concluded his ruling with the following words, which I believe apply to the present ruling.

The following quotation is from the *Journals* of June 19, 1959, at page 586: "In finding that a question of the privileges of the House is not *prima facie* involved in this motion, I am making a procedural decision the effect of which will not prevent the further discussion by the House of the matters in issue. The effect is to refuse precedence to this discussion but not to prevent it. No barrier is raised to the presentation of this matter under different circumstances on another occasion. For example, the subject matter could be brought before the House as an amendment to the next motion to go into Supply."

These words of a learned and distinguished former Speaker apply very well to the present situation.

Mr. Macdonald, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of correspondence dated February 25 and March 8, 1972, exchanged between the

Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Premier of the Province of Alberta, with regard to the relationship between the two governments in energy policy matters.—Sessional Paper No. 284-5/75.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That this House condemns the government for the disastrous failure of its regional development programmes to make any progress in eliminating regional disparities and, in particular, condemns the government for the lack of planning or strategy in its programmes, for its total reliance on give-away grants to private corporations, most of them foreign owned, for the senseless practice of transplanting unemployment by assisting plants in one location while similar plants are being closed in another location and for the wasteful expenditure of large sums of public funds without appreciable results in jobs and economic development in the disadvantaged areas of Canada.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the motion expired.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Flemming for Mr. MacKay on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley) for Mr. Barnett on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Halifax) for Mr. Peddle on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Nystrom for Mr. Peters on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Marchand, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on the Operation of the Regional De-

velopment Incentives Act for the period February 1 to February 29, 1972, pursuant to section 16 of the said Act, chapter R-3, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/323.

By Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,
—Report on the Administration of the Canada Student
Loans Act for the year ended June 30, 1971, pursuant to

section 18 of the said Act, chapter S-17, R.S.C., 1970.
(English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/245.

At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House
until Monday at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing
Order 2(1).

No. 18

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, MARCH 13, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Trudeau, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of letter dated March 9, 1972, addressed by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of Canada to the Prime Minister of Quebec, with respect to family allowances, manpower centres and adult occupational training. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-5/155.

Mr. Trudeau, laid upon the Table,—Copies of letter dated March 9, 1972, addressed by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of Canada to the Premiers of the provinces, with respect to family allowances, manpower centres and adult occupational training. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-5/52.

Pursuant to Standing Order 60(2), Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, designated an Order of the Day for consideration on Tuesday, March 14, 1972 of the Ways and Means Motion to amend the Income Tax Act.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Stanfield, seconded by Mr. Hees, moved,—That this House, alarmed at this government's inability to deal with the accumulating problems of urbanization in Canada, declares that a federal government must cooperate in good faith with provincial and municipal governments in planning and in implementing policies on revenue sharing, interurban transportation, housing, urban poverty, pollution and rural depopulation.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the motion expired.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Nielsen for Mr. Noble on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Pringle for Mr. Rock on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Nowlan for Mr. Danforth on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Dinsdale for Mr. McGrath on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Groos for Mr. Anderson on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Cullen for Mr. Lessard (LaSalle) on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski) for Mr. Crossman on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

At 10.22 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 19

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Kaplan, from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Friday, March 3, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, and has agreed to report it without amendment.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 and 2*) is tabled.

(A copy of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 1 to the Journals).

Pursuant to Standing Order 43, on motion of Mr. Pringle seconded by Mr. Penner, it was ordered,—That the allegations concerning wiretapping and opening of

mail of Members of this House be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The Order being read for the consideration of a Ways and Means motion to amend the Income Tax Act (Ses-sional Paper No. 284-1/308), laid upon the Table, Tuesday, February 22, 1972;

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), moved,—That the said motion be now concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Pursuant to Standing Order 60(11), on motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), Bill C-169, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading and reference to a Committee of the Whole House at the next sitting of the House.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-4, An Act to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways System and Air Canada for the period from the 1st day of January, 1971, to the 30th day of June, 1972, and to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railway Company and certain debentures to be issued by Air Canada, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to *Standing Order 15(4)*]

(Public Bills)

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. Whelan, seconded by Mr. Hopkins, Bill C-55, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, was read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment and concurred in, read the third time and passed.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. Deakon, seconded by Mr. Badanai, Bill C-74, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, was read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment and concurred in, read the third time and passed.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. Hopkins, seconded by Mr. Gendron, Bill C-92, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, was read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment and concurred in, read the third time and passed.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. Lajoie, seconded by Mr. Gendron, Bill C-167, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, was read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole and reported with an amendment.

On motion of Mr. Deachman, seconded by Mr. Jerome, the said bill, as amended, was concurred in, read a third time and passed.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-4, An Act to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways System and Air Canada for the

period from the 1st day of January, 1971, to the 30th day of June, 1972, and to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railway Company and certain debentures to be issued by Air Canada, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley), seconded by Mr. Harding, moved in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-4 be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months hence.

And debate arising thereon;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to *Standing Order 40(1)*;

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to *Standing Order 65(4)(b)*, membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Pringle for Mr. Crossman on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Murphy for Mr. Rock on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mrs. MacInnis for Mr. Orlikow on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Schumacher, Smith (Saint Jean), Portelance, Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean) and Breau for Messrs. Alkenbrack, Badanai, Forget, Marceau and Robinson on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Hees for Mr. Flemming on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Messrs. Mather, Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean) and Breau for Messrs. Benjamin, Trudel and McNulty on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. MacKay for Mr. Fairweather on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Rynard for Mr. Alexander on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Alkenbrack for Mr. Schumacher on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Rock for Mr. Dinsdale on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Crossman for Mr. Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean) on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Stafford for Mr. Deakon on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Messrs. Côté (Richelieu) and Robinson for Messrs. Cullen and Stafford on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. McNulty for Mr. Breau on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Murta for Mr. Alkenbrack on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Loiselle and Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay) for Messrs. Allmand and Forget on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Marchand, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Capital Budgets of the Cape Breton Development Corporation, for the year ending December 31, 1972, pursuant to sections 21 and 26 of the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act, chapter C-13, R.S.C., 1970, together with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1972-338, dated February 24, 1972, approving same. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/107.

By Mr. Olson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Capital Budget of the Farm Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, pursuant to section 70(2) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970, (English and French), together with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1972-403, dated March 2, 1972, approving same.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/143.

At 10.25 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 20

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Laflamme, from the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered Vote 10 relating to the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada and commends it to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issue No. 1*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 2 to the Journals).

Pursuant to Standing Order 43, on motion of Mr. Reid, seconded by Mr. Foster, it was ordered,—That the subject-matter of the refusal of the Public Service Commission to grant leave to Miss Anne Booth, a lawyer with the C.R.T.C., to seek a political nomination, be referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure respecting payment of benefits in respect of children; to provide that such benefits will be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; to provide for the calculation of such benefits and the determination of the persons or institutions to whom they are payable and the times at which they are payable; to provide for the adjustment and protection of such benefits; to provide for consequential amendments to the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Income Tax Act and the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Revision Act, 1964, and for the repeal of the Family Allowances Act and the Youth Allowances Act; and to provide for matters in connection with the administration of the Act.

Ordered,—That there be laid before this House, a copy of the consultant report by Canadian Facts Company Limited, on a public opinion survey undertaken for the Department of Labour in the fiscal year 1968-69, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the 1st Session of this Parliament.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 32.—Mr. Skoberg*).

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That speeches on the motion under the order Business of Supply be limited to fifteen minutes with the exception of the mover, the principal speaker on behalf of the government who shall be limited to thirty minutes and the principal speakers of the other opposition parties who shall be limited to fifteen minutes.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Asselin, seconded by Mr. Hees, moved,— That this House urges the government to expedite those public services which affect the quality of life so that entitlement to status and payment of benefits may be sooner established and paid, and in particular, in respect of unemployment insurance benefits, pension and assistance benefits, immigration and passport procedures, post office deliveries, and public service collective bargaining.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the motion expired.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Moore and Stewart (Marquette) for Messrs. Downey and Mazankowski on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Gleave and Gervais for Mrs. MacInnis and Mr. Rock on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. McCleave for Mr. Nielsen on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Messrs. McKinley, Southam and Murta for Messrs. Rynard, Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand) and Hales on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Basford, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Second Revised Capital Budget of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the year ending December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 70(2) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970, as approved by Order in Council P.C. 1972-450, dated March 7, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/109.

By Mr. Jamieson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of exemptions authorized by the Minister of Transport under sections 109, 110, 132 and 133 of the Canada Shipping Act in cases where no master or officer was available with required certificate and experience, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 134(2) of the said Act, chapter S-9, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/239.

By unanimous consent, at 5.58 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 21

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Lessard (LaSalle), from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of February 28, 1972, your Committee recommends that it be granted permission to adjourn from place to place within South-western Ontario during the week of April 16, 1972 for the purpose of hearing representations on the rail passenger service in the area, and that the necessary supporting staff do accompany the Committee.

Mr. Kaplan, from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, presented the Second Report of the said Committee which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Thursday, March 2, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-164, An Act to incorporate United Bank of Canada, and has agreed to report it without amendment.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issue No. 3*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 3 to the Journals).

Mr. MacGuigan, from the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada, presented the Final Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

PART I—THE CONSTITUTION

Chapter 1—Constitutional Imperatives

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Canada should have a new and distinctively Canadian Constitution, one which would be a new whole even though it would utilize many of the same parts. (See Chapter 3 as well as Chapter 1).**
2. **A new Canadian Constitution should be based on functional considerations, which would lead to greater decentralization of governmental powers in areas touching culture and social policy and to greater centralization in powers which have important economic effects at the national level. Functional considerations also require greater decentralization in many areas of governmental administration.**

In presenting its Final Report to both Houses of Parliament, the Committee is under no illusion that it is pronouncing the final word upon the Canadian Constitution. For even if we succeed in our goal of marking out new paths for Canadian federalism, actual constitutional changes will come about as a result of intergovernmental negotiations in which our Report certainly will not be the only factor taken into account. More important, as was pointed out several times in the course of our hearings, every federal constitution must be constantly in the process of being remade, if it is to continue to meet the needs of the times. Whether such changes take place with or without formal amendment of the constitution, no constitution can remain fixed as of any one point of time.

Nevertheless we find the task of formulating recommendations on the Canadian Constitution at this point of time an essential duty as well as a challenging one. For the views expressed to us by very many Canadians in all parts of the country, as well as our own analysis of ideas and events, have convinced us that *Canada needs a new constitution now*. We are also convinced that there is a consensus among Canadians in favour of a *more functional federalism*, whatever the consequences to vested governmental interests. In our opinion a more functional federalism would involve an increased centralization in some respects, an increased decentralization in others.

The need for a new constitution has been amply demonstrated. The considerable number of expert witnesses who appeared before us indicated many areas of weakness in the British North America Act, and we shall pursue this subject in Chapter 3. But more significant than the deficiencies in the B.N.A. Act are the feelings of Canadians about their present Constitution. People in all

parts of the country feel that the Constitution is preventing their governments from doing what they would like to see them do, that it is not sufficiently functional in its allocation of governmental powers, and above all that it is not representing Canada as it is and as it is coming to be.

The most critical challenge focusses on Quebec's role in Confederation. Questions of Quebec's self-expression and development, culture, language, poverty and unemployment are part of this challenge. Its intensity and magnitude alone, with its threat to our very continuance as a state, is enough to justify constitutional reform.

Indeed, the process of constitutional review was initially set in motion by dissatisfaction in Quebec with respect to the status quo, and this dissatisfaction is still the most acute reason for constitutional change. But constitutional reform is not for Quebec alone nor is it desired by Quebec alone. We found substantial discontent in the West, the Northern Territories and the Atlantic Provinces, and residents of Ontario also expressed their displeasure with some parts of the constitutional picture. We also encountered feelings of dissatisfaction from many groups—native peoples, some ethnic groups, French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec, and the young generally.

Of course, some of this feeling is wrongly directed against the Constitution. Not all of our problems are constitutional. Many are geographical, economic, cultural or broadly political. Yet constitutional problems are a sufficient part of the whole that reexamination of our constitutional arrangements has become both inevitable and urgent.

One of the most pressing needs is the protection of the individual person, through a comprehensive Bill of Rights and through linguistic guarantees to individuals. Equally pressing is the need for the recognition and protection of minority ethnic groups, including the native peoples. Their contribution to our country should be formally recognized and their natural vitality encouraged.

The most acute cultural-linguistic crisis is that of the French minority in Canada. The original desire of the British Government in the years immediately after 1763 to assimilate the French-speaking community was revived and strengthened by Lord Durham's Report in 1839, which recommended assimilation on the one hand and responsible government on the other. The determination of the British Government to achieve assimilation and to deny responsible government was not matched by the

English-speaking majority in Canada in either respect, and in the course of the 1840s Canadian political leaders were able to gain their objective of responsible government without sacrificing the French fact in Canada. In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that it was the association of the Anglophone, Baldwin, and the Francophone, Lafontaine, which brought about responsible government. This political choice by the Canadians of that time to reject assimilation as a policy formed a basis of the subsequent union of the Provinces in Confederation, and has never been regretted by the vast majority of our people. But despite the fact that assimilation is not a current threat in the Province of Quebec, the French-speaking community needs to be given reassurance, and provided with the means, to ensure its preservation and its full development.

There are really two issues involved. The first has to do with the French-speaking community outside Quebec, whose survival can be guaranteed and encouraged principally by the direct action of the Federal Government, along with the cooperation of the nine other provinces. The other is the question of French culture in Quebec. We are convinced that French culture cannot survive anywhere in Canada unless it flourishes in Quebec. The vitality of French Quebec is therefore the principal measure of the vitality of French Canada.

The Committee rejects the theory that Canada is divided into only two cultures, not because we do not wish to give full protection to the rights of French-speaking citizens, but because the concept is too confined to do justice to our reality as a people. In the sociological sense most would agree that there is a French-speaking Canadian nation, but there is no single English-speaking nation in the same sense. In the face of this cultural plurality there can be no official Canadian culture or cultures. But in order to preserve French as a living, as well as a legal, official language, we must also preserve the culture of which it is an organic part.

We acknowledge a cultural imperative for Quebec: it must have sufficient control over its collective life to ensure the preservation and development of French-Canadian culture. Put another way, the Constitution must guarantee the preservation of the collective personality of French Quebec. In the expansion of provincial powers which we propose, Quebec would gain new powers to achieve these ends.

Some witnesses in Quebec spoke to us about the option of independence for Quebec. The Committee respects their sincerity. If English-speaking Canada were totally unsympathetic to Quebec's true aspirations and had clearly set its face against constitutional change of any kind, then separation might become inevitable. But that is not how we read the mood of English-speaking Canada.

Most of the problems of a dynamic and evolving Quebec would not change their character through independence. The problems would only be transferred from Canada to the independent state of Quebec. Quebec would remain an outpost of French culture in the alien cultural environment of North America. It could, of course, be argued that such problems as that of the working language could be attacked in a determined way within an independent Quebec. But we are convinced that, on a long term basis, French-Canadian culture and cultural survival would not be better served by relying on an economically weaker

and more isolated Quebec. It is clear to us that a "go-it-alone" policy would weaken Quebec's position in dealing with this awesome reality.

We have spoken of the need for an increase in both centralization and decentralization, depending on functional considerations. In our view greater decentralization in areas of culture and social policy would benefit all the Provinces. We propose such decentralization for reasons of functionalism and flexibility, and to meet the regional differences which became obvious to us in the course of our hearings. Consequently we propose an expansion of Provincial powers in areas like income support, criminal law, marriage and divorce, educational television, taxing powers, and international arrangements, and we support limitations on Federal powers with respect to appointments to the Senate and the Supreme Court, and with respect to Federal spending in fields of Provincial jurisdiction.

On the other hand, greater centralization is necessary in the regulation of the economy. Hence there should be a transfer of some existing Provincial powers to the Federal Parliament. We have in mind, particularly, an increase in Federal jurisdiction over air and water pollution, international and interprovincial trade and commerce, incomes, securities regulation, financial institutions, unfair competition, and foreign ownership.

At the same time, we favour considerable administrative decentralization in the operations of the Federal Government. This change of administrative direction requires no change in the Constitution. It does require a change of heart. It involves the recognition that geographically Canada is a very, very large country. From its extremities the centre of the nation looks and feels very far away. The injection of the judgments and feelings of Canadians from these areas into a more regionalized government service, would be tangible proof that the central government wishes to reach out to all Canadians.

The result of such a decentralized administration would be, we hope, a more responsive public service. In the sense that it is ultimately the job of government to serve people, such a public service would probably be more efficient.

These power transfers and administrative rearrangements would necessitate not only a new spirit of cooperation among the eleven governments of Canada, but also new cooperative structures. We do not think it wise to theorize too much in the area of governmental structures. But we shall have some suggestions to make. One objective is to avoid increasing governmental structures solely for the purpose of creating intellectually tidy superstructures. We would also recognize that the Government of Canada should in the future exercise leadership principally by persuasion rather than by directive.

Regardless of how Canada is articulated—whether in terms of regions, cultural or ethnic communities, or governmental institutions—none of these are enough without the will to succeed as a people. A state is constituted principally by its people's collective will to live together. If that falters, very little else remains. In our travels across Canada we did hear some doubts about our future. But we also found Canadians still dedicated to constructive solutions within a federal structure. The common strain binding Canadians together is a pervading goodwill

towards groups other than their own. This spirit was often manifested, in all parts of Canada, and particularly by the young. Tolerant, willing to look at their fellow Canadians in the most generous light, they showed both the appetite and the courage necessary to produce creative change. But they also have serious doubts as to the capacity of our institutions for the self-renewal which would effect the changes they believe necessary. Their own remarks to us arose from deeply rooted feelings which often stripped away institutional facades.

These younger Canadians are proud of Canada. But it is not a narrow, self-seeking pride. It is an open and generous pride in Canadians as Canadians. They believe in themselves and their ability to build a new and better Canada. They feel the urgency of finding workable new approaches to Canadian problems.

Finally, all Canadians have aspirations for a truly human life which go beyond our government and our constitution. Their idealistic quest can be facilitated by a constitution which points the way towards personal as well as collective goals.

The task of writing such a new constitution will not be easy but is certainly not impossible. A modern constitution for Canada is ultimately a restatement of our faith in ourselves and in our country. As such it is a bold challenge to the mind and heart of Canada. We invite all Canadians and their governments to address themselves to the urgency of this task. We would be astonished if, after the growing public awareness of the last decade, some Canadians still doubted that our nation is in the midst of the most serious crisis in its history. We urge them to press, with us, for the writing of a new Constitution.

Chapter 2—The Mandate

The Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada had its genesis in resolutions passed in the House of Commons and Senate on January 27 and February 17, 1970, respectively, in the Second Session of the 28th Parliament. The Committee was reconstituted with similar terms of reference at the beginning of the Third Session, by resolutions which stated in part:

That a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons be appointed to examine and report upon proposals, made public, or which are from time to time made public by the Government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitution of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the Provinces in February, 1968, and alternative proposals on the same subjects . . . That the Committee have power to adjourn from place to place within Canada.

The Committee was reconstituted at the beginning of the Fourth Session with the same terms of reference.

The Committee held 145 public meetings, including 72 sessions in 47 cities and towns, and received more than 8,000 pages of evidence. Included in this evidence were the views of acknowledged experts on the Constitution, most of whom the Committee heard at meetings in Ottawa. In addition, the Committee travelled extensively throughout Canada, visiting all Provinces and Territories, and received the views and opinions of Canadians from all walks of life on the fundamental issues confronting Canada and its constitutional development. The total attendance at Committee meetings was approximately 13,000 and 1,486 Canadians appeared as witnesses. The highest attendances were in the Provinces of British Columbia and Quebec, in each of which more than 3,000 people attended our meetings.

As its terms of reference make clear, the Special Joint Committee on the Constitution of Canada is charged with the responsibility of making a report to both Houses of Parliament on proposals for change in the Canadian Constitution, after hearing the views of the people from coast to coast. No previous Parliamentary Committee has ever held such an ambitious series of hearings in order to acquaint itself with public opinion. In addition, the Committee developed a new procedure to encourage participation by the man in the street: instead of hearing as wit-

nesses only people who had prepared written briefs, the Committee encouraged people to speak extemporaneously at its meetings from microphones placed on the floor. After its initial experiences with audience reactions, it established time limits on presentations: 15 minutes for briefs of which there was advance notice, 10 minutes for briefs where the notice was simultaneous with the meeting, and 3 minutes for spontaneous contributions from the floor. Normally after each formal brief there were short questions from three Committee members, and then questions or comments were allowed from the floor. At its best, where the comments were relevant and where there was a divergence of viewpoint, the procedure produced a dialogue of high quality.

Anyone who thinks about government today must realize the necessity of expanding the traditional procedures of parliamentary and executive decision-making. In general, we Committee members feel that our experiment in participation has been a considerable success, and that it has made a contribution to the development of better procedures of democratic government. We are of the view that this exercise was highly successful in bringing Parliament into closer contact with the people, particularly in the smaller centres, and that more frequent use should be made of travelling Parliamentary Committees to meet the people at large. Our procedure enabled us to learn a great deal about Canada and the views of Canadians, from the spoken words and the spontaneous reactions of audiences and above all from the challenge of the dialogue itself—and our learning was not restricted to problems of the Constitution. At the same time we realize that meetings such as ours have their limitations: they tend to attract those people who are more vocal or more set in their attitudes (and this is especially true of those who are most likely to speak at the meetings), and are thus not so well adapted to uncovering the views of the silent majority; informal as they are by parliamentary standards, they will have the full parliamentary panoply of transcription of evidence, simultaneous interpretation, and rules of order, and so may appear to be unduly inhibiting or overly formal for some citizens; and, finally, the disadvantaged groups in our society (Indians, Métis, Eskimos, the urban and the rural poor) are often not able, or do not feel able, to conceptualize and express their grievances against "the system" in such a setting, if at all—they have perhaps more need of social animators than of an investigating committee. Our satisfaction in the success of our hearings is thus tempered by our realization of their inherent limitations.

While the Committee has no way of determining with scientific accuracy whether the attendance at the meetings was representative of all of the communities visited, our collective judgment, based both on our common experiences and on what political insight we may possess, is that we are entitled to state certain broad impressions as to what Canadians generally feel about the future shape of their country and its Constitution. The eloquence and, at times, passion with which Canadians expressed their basic feelings about their country added, as well, a human dimension to the Committee's mandate.

The principal constitutional events during the two years of the Committee's existence have been the Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conferences, especially the Conference in Victoria in June 1971. We are not discouraged by the apparent deadlock of that Conference. We believe that the governments of Canada have made a great deal of progress in their negotiations, and that, the issue of social policy apart, the Victoria Charter represents a consensus among all the governments in a number of areas. More-

over, we believe that the very lack of complete accord at Victoria points the way to final success, for it indicates the necessity of a broadening of perspective to include the totality of constitutional problems, and especially the whole of the division of powers. Acting on this belief, we here propose a general constitutional settlement.

As the product of a committee, this Report represents the highest common factor of some thirty minds. It is not, as a whole, a unanimous report. On most points there was some divergence of opinion, on some points a great deal. Probably no member of the Committee would personally prefer the totality of the recommendations. Nevertheless, we have hammered out an agreement which is at the bottom at least a tolerable compromise to all the political groupings on the Committee. To the extent that the Committee is a true microcosm of Canadian society, we may hope that our agreement here will provide an acceptable proposal for the principal streams of opinion in the country.

Chapter 3—Why a New Constitution?

The purpose of a constitution is to distribute the powers of government according to the wishes of a particular national community and to enunciate its fundamental values and common goals. A constitution ought thus to be both an inspiration and a mirror for its community. Of these two ends, its inspirational role is the more important. A community that is unable to justify its existence to itself will eventually find that it cannot survive by structure alone.

Taken in this broad sense, a constitution may not be contained entirely, or even largely, in a written document or documents. It is not essential that it should be. What is essential is that a people should understand, accept and even love their form of government. Without the understanding of its people a constitution is meaningless. Without their affection it is dead.

The constitution of a particular people is in part determined by their history and circumstances, in part freely chosen for its apparent merits. The Canadian people chose responsible government largely by reason of their history, a federal system by reason of their geography and demography. The choice of a federal system made a written document inevitable.

The process of conceiving and formulating a written constitution in all its dimensions forces a people to a clearer realization of their distinctive character and aspirations. Once achieved, it provides a self-awareness which reinforces the fundamental institutions and personality of the people. As well, it is a national ideal to which the thoughts and energies and passions of the people can—and should—be directed.

The Canadian Constitution may be said to be at present principally contained in the British North America Act of 1867. But we must note the limitations of this statement. The original Act has itself been subject to direct amendment many times, and it has also been indirectly amended by the United Kingdom Parliament, by the Parliament of Canada, and by the Provincial Legislatures according to their respective powers. In addition, the effect of its various sections has been greatly altered by decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and, since 1949, of the Supreme Court of Canada. It has also been affected by a myriad of administrative arrangements which have been worked out between the Federal and the Provincial Governments, including the establishment of Federal-Provincial Conferences. Moreover, it has been touched by the ebb and flow of political and economic power between the

central and the regional governments under the influence of wars, developments in transportation and communication, changes in business organization, and changing tax yields. Finally, the theory and practice of responsible government, which is the heart of our whole system of government, was ignored entirely by the B.N.A. Act and left to the realm of constitutional conventions.

Clearly, then, the B.N.A. Act has never been taken to be the whole of the Canadian Constitution. Moreover, it has not remained static even as law, and its total significance has been considerably altered by socio-economic events. Nevertheless, as formally amended and realistically interpreted, it is substantially the whole of our written constitution and, more important, is the fundamental framework in relation to which every part of the total constitution must be seen. Rights and privileges of all kinds, even responsible government itself, exist only insofar as they are not altered by the Act. We must therefore judge the adequacy of our present Constitution by reference to the adequacy of the B.N.A. Act.

To take the position that the present Canadian Constitution is to be judged on the basis of the British North America Act is not to confuse the totality of the Constitution with the Act. The Act is the keystone of the constitutional arch, and its weaknesses are transmitted to the whole structure. Thus the inadequacies of the B.N.A. Act are those of the Constitution itself.

The measure of the inadequacy of the British North America Act is that it does not serve Canadians fully as either a mirror of ourselves or as an inspirational ideal. As enacted in 1867, it did not attempt explicitly to set forth any values or goals of that time except to adopt "a Constitution similar in Principle to that of the United Kingdom." Whatever values it recognizes are implicit in that statement, or have to be inferred from the governmental structure and division of powers it establishes.

Even the distribution of powers between the Imperial and Canadian governments and between the Federal and Provincial governments does not reflect the Canadian reality of today: an independent, democratic, officially bilingual, multicultural, federal state. The imperial power of London over Ottawa in the Act was matched by that of Ottawa over the provincial capitals. As one witness remarked, "In the early years after Confederation, the provinces were treated like colonies of Ottawa with limited powers of self-government." (3.24:12)

The B.N.A. Act can still be directly amended by an act of the United Kingdom Parliament. The royal power to disallow any Federal law within two years of its passage (s. 56) and the Federal power similarly to disallow any Provincial law (s. 90) are anachronistic today. They would make a mockery of Canadian independence, and of the distribution of governmental powers within Canada. In the case of the royal power the British Government undertook at the London Conference of 1929 not to use it again, but it has not been removed from the Act. The Federal power of disallowance has not been used since 1943, but also remains in the Act.

The role of the Supreme Court of Canada, the final interpreter of all our laws since 1949, is nowhere mentioned in the Act. Moreover, although Canada officially ceased to be part of the British Empire with the Statute of Westminster in 1931, the only treaty power which is provided for in the Act is that of implementing Empire treaties (s. 132). Then, too, the very limited provisions of section 133, guaranteeing the right to the use of the English and French languages in the Parliament of Canada and in the Legislature of Quebec and in Federal and Quebec courts, are no longer sufficient in a state dedicated to two official languages. Finally, the division of powers no longer appears to be sufficiently functional.

Although the constitution of a colony is not an adequate constitution for a nation, the British North America Act could not be said to have been a failure. It was an adequate enough constitution for the Canada of 1867—perhaps, the only possible constitution for that day—and, it has served us well as a basic framework of government—though increasingly less well as the years have gone by. In taking the position that Canada needs a new Constitution now, we are far from criticizing what our statesmen have wrought in the past.

A constitutional renewal now is all the more necessary as a result of the popular interest which has developed in the Constitution. This interest in the Constitution was, perhaps, kindled by the "Quiet Revolution" begun by the

Lesage Government in the Province of Quebec in 1960. It was recognized, and in turn augmented, by the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference sponsored by the Government of Ontario in November, 1967 and by the constitutional review formally undertaken by all the governments of Canada at the Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conference in February of 1968. This initial Constitutional Conference has been followed by five others, several of which were conducted in the full view of the people through continuous radio and television coverage. We believe that it has also been focussed and increased by the apparent success of this Committee in obtaining widespread participation across the country in our constitutional dialogue, as described in Chapter 2. The Constitution has often appeared to people as a "Linus blanket" for politicians unable or unwilling to act. We have also found, however, considerable evidence of an understanding of it as a positive means to meet new and challenging needs.

Moreover, the people now want a new constitution. The limited goal of "constitutional review" established by the first Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conference in 1968 has long been outmoded. The only goal which is now acceptable to most Canadians is a new constitution. An expectation of change has been built up, and in our view cannot be frustrated without serious consequences for the national psyche. The process of review, once undertaken, must lead irreversibly to a new constitution.

We are convinced that a new Constitution is essential to a Canada with the kind of future Canadians envisage. The present Constitution needs a fundamental recasting. It needs to be rethought and reformulated in terms that are meaningful to Canadians now. For this reason we call for a new Constitution: one that is a new whole, even though it may utilize many of the same parts. Our aim is not novelty, so we have no hesitation in adopting what is functional in the present Constitution. But we insist on a new perspective which will embrace all the constituent parts in a whole that is at the same time distinctively Canadian and functionally contemporary.

Chapter 4—Patriation of the Constitution

RECOMMENDATION

3. The Canadian Constitution should be patriated by a procedure which would provide for a simultaneous proclamation of a new Constitution by Canada and the renunciation by Britain of all jurisdiction over the Canadian Constitution.

The question of patriation was not explicitly dealt with in the Victoria Charter, but is mentioned in conclusion 3 of the statement of conclusions of the Conference. Presumably, therefore, the fuller agreement on this subject at the Conference in February, 1971 stands. Few things would better symbolize the independence of Canada or the coming of a new constitution than the patriation of the Constitution from the United Kingdom of Canada.

At the same time it would be unwise to proceed with patriation in the absence of agreement on an amending procedure. The present amending procedure is humiliating to an independent state, but it is nevertheless effective. Amendment formally takes place by act of the British Parliament, which follows the constitutional convention that the United Kingdom Parliament will make any amendment to the British North America Act which is requested by the Government of Canada. Such a request of the Government of Canada is traditionally preceded by a joint address of both Houses of the Parliament of Canada. Some argue that there is a secondary convention that the Canadian Parliament will request amendments only with unanimous consent of all the provinces, or of the provinces affected where not all provinces are involved. However, the British Parliament has shown, by its refusal to entertain objections from Provincial Governments in disputed cases, that it will follow the request of the Canadian Parliament without reference to the views of the Provinces. It seems therefore safe to assert that, as a matter of mixed law and convention, the Parliament of Canada possesses the unilateral power to change the Constitution. Nevertheless Parliament has not chosen to exercise that power since 1949, and the Government of Canada has sought the unanimous agreement of the Provinces to the constitutional changes which have recently

been contemplated. This recent practice of seeking unanimous agreement makes a less rigid amending formula desirable.

The legal procedures which the February Conference evolved for patriation would operate as follows: following agreement among the governments of Canada as to an amending formula and as to any substantive changes, the Parliament of Canada and all the Provincial Legislatures would pass resolutions authorizing the Governor General to issue a proclamation containing the formula and any substantive changes agreed to; before the issuance of the proclamation the British Parliament would be asked to take all necessary steps to ensure the legal validity of the procedures including the nullification of any British statutes, present or future, which purport to affect the Canadian Constitution; finally, the Governor General's proclamation would be timed to coincide with the effective date of the British renunciation of jurisdiction.

The complexity of these procedures results from the desire, on the one hand, to avoid having a new Canadian Constitution brought into being solely by an act of the British Parliament, and the fear, on the other hand, that, if it was not so grounded, there might be a legal gap which might conceivably lead to a court's invalidating the whole new Constitution. The effect of the agreed procedures is to have the negative action which removes Canada from the jurisdiction of the British Parliament and the positive action by which we proclaim our new Constitution occur simultaneously so that both legal continuity and national autonomy are safeguarded.

There are no precedents in such an area, and one can only speculate about possible judicial reaction to the procedures. Nevertheless, since there is no apparent deficiency in them, it is hard to believe that any Canadian judge would strain language or law to invalidate them, since they would represent the solemnly expressed will of all the legislative bodies in Canada. We are therefore prepared to accept the suggested procedures for patriation of the Constitution without any fears that they would not be legally viable.

Chapter 5—Amendments to the Constitution

RECOMMENDATION

4. The formula for amending the Constitution should be that contained in the Victoria Charter of June 1971, which requires the agreement of the Federal Parliament and a majority of the Provincial Legislatures, including those of:

(a) every province which at any time has contained twenty-five percent of the population of Canada;

(b) at least two Atlantic Provinces;

(c) at least two Western Provinces that have a combined population of at least fifty percent of the population of all the Western Provinces.

The new amending formula is contained in articles 49 to 57 of the Victoria Charter. The formula is as follows: in general, constitutional amendments would require a resolution of consent at the Federal level, plus the consent of the Legislatures of a majority of the Provinces including (a) the Legislature of any Province now containing at least 25 per cent of the population of Canada, and of any other province that hereafter reaches the same percentage of the population; and (b) the Legislatures of at least two Provinces west of Ontario providing that the consenting Provinces comprise 50 per cent of the population of the Provinces west of Ontario; and (c) the Legislatures of at least two Provinces east of Quebec. The only exceptions to the preceding formula are as to matters peculiar to the constitutions of Parliament or of the Provinces or of concern to less than all the Provinces. In effect, a constitutional amendment would require the agreement of the Federal Parliament, of the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec and of two Atlantic and two Western provinces, with a special rider as to the composition of the two Western provinces that we shall have to look at closely.

To our mind the new formula is a substantial improvement over the Fulton-Favreau Formula. While that Formula may have appeared to require for constitutional amendment only the agreement of the Federal Parliament and of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the Provinces representing 50 per cent of the population of Canada according to the latest census, actually the amendment of any important section of the British North America Act would have required the agreement of all the Provincial Legislatures, since included in the category requiring unanimous agreement were all the powers in sections 91, 92 and 93 of that Act (except that the consent of New-

foundland would not have been required for amendments to section 93). In effect, therefore, the earlier formula would have required unanimous agreement on all matters of moment, whereas the new one is content with the approval of six provinces on a weighted basis. The theory on which the Fulton-Favreau Formula was based was that each province has an equal right to a veto, since each is equally a province.

In our view what was objectionable about the Fulton-Favreau Formula was this rigidity. We are of the opinion that an amending formula must be a blend of rigidity and flexibility, and that the lower the number of provinces with veto power over amendments the more satisfactory the formula is likely to be. In fact, our only criticism of the new formula is the element of rigidity which is incorporated in the requirement concerning the consent of the Western Provinces.

We have no fault to find with lodging a veto power in the legislatures of provinces which contain at least 25 per cent of the population of the country. Provinces which represent that sizeable a proportion of the population can reasonably expect that their consent will be necessary for constitutional amendment. Since Ontario and Quebec would now acquire a veto on this basis, they will on the formula never lose that veto even if their population should dip below the 25 per cent proportion in the future. Moreover, it is only fitting that any province that hereafter contains 25 per cent of the population should also gain a veto.

The only problem is with the position gained by British Columbia. The requirement for the weighted consent of the Western Provinces is to the effect that consent is required from two Provinces comprising 50 per cent of the population west of Ontario. Some present population projections suggest that British Columbia will possess more than 50 per cent of the population of the Provinces west of Ontario at some point in the 1990s. At such a time even the agreement of the other three Western Provinces would not be sufficient to carry an amendment without the consent of British Columbia. The affirmative adherence, however, of British Columbia would still not be enough to carry an amendment without the support of another Western Province.

On the question of the role of the Senate in the amendment procedure at the Federal level there is a case for the position that the Senate should not be consulted at all with respect to constitutional amendments, on the ground

that the protection of regional interests (which is the *raison d'être* of the Senate) would already be provided for by the requirement of provincial consent. However, it appears to us that there would remain a need for the protection of regional interests by the Senate, since the amending procedure contemplates the possibility of the passage of a constitutional amendment against the will of two Atlantic and two Western provinces. The Senate could fulfill a useful role by acting as a safeguard for the interests of dissenting provinces.

On the other hand, it would be undesirable to allow the Senate an absolute veto over an amendment which was desired by the required majority of provinces and by a majority of members of the House of Commons. We therefore agree with the proposal of Article 51 of the Charter that the Senate veto over constitutional amendments should be limited.

In sum, we endorse the proposed amending formula as a feasible approach to constitutional amendment, and would not expect to see its general terms substantially improved on, no matter how long intergovernmental negotiations were carried on. Such an amending formula would have not only a long-range value as an effective means of future amendment, but also an enormous immediate value. Until now, the Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conferences have proceeded on the basis that unanimous agreement is required for any proposal to be adopted. The lack of unanimity among the various governments has therefore resulted in a lack of agreement on substantive proposals. The immediate adoption of this formula of amendment would thus provide a new procedural rule for the conduct of future Conferences.

We would merely add that we understand the formula to leave open the question of delegation of powers, and we shall consider this question in Chapter 17.

Chapter 6—The Preamble to the Constitution

RECOMMENDATION

5. The Canadian Constitution should have a preamble which would proclaim the basic objectives of Canadian federal democracy.

In the course of this Report we make a number of references to matters which ought to be included in the preamble to a new Canadian Constitution. We thus propose the inclusion in the preamble of the following basic objectives of our society: a federal system of government within a democratic society; the enhancing of basic human rights; developing Canada as a bilingual and multicultural country; recognition of Canada's native peoples; the promotion of economic, social and cultural equality; the reduction of regional disparities; the advancement of Canada as a free and open society based on the consent of its people; the striving for world peace and security.

As we have mentioned earlier, a Constitution ought to reflect its community. The preamble in any Constitution can play an important role as a source of inspiration to a country. It can state in the broadest possible terms the objectives and aspirations of the society it governs. A preamble is not legally binding in the narrow sense, yet, if it can achieve an enduring statement of national ideals, it may have a greater psychological value for citizens than any other part of the document.

It may seem to some that Canadians have no need for an inspirational chord in the Constitution. They sometimes argue that we should have a written Constitution, but without any preamble. This, they claim, would be more reflective of the view Canadians have of themselves: dependable, unpretentious—at worst, colourless, at best, solid gray.

We do not feel that this view of Canada reflects the Canada of the 1970s—if, indeed, it ever reflected Canada. The question of whether or not our Constitution ought to have a preamble should be decided in principle before we worry about whether or not we are simply aping any other country.

We support the inclusion of a preamble in the new Canadian Constitution. The preamble is the only place in the Constitution where we can state in broad language what kind of a country Canada is and what it aspires to be. The rest of the Constitution, which will be subject to judicial interpretation, must be drafted with some precision and particularity. The preamble, on the other hand, gives us the broad directions in which we are going; it is

not a detailed route map. As the Federal Government's position paper *The Constitution and the People of Canada* puts it at page 4:

The first element in Canada's Constitution, in the view of the Government of Canada, should be a statement—a preamble—on the objectives of the federation. The basic role of the Constitution is, of course, to define the system of law and of government which shall prevail in Canada. But before doing this, the Constitution must express the purpose of Canadians in having become and resolving to remain associated together in a single country, and it must express as far as this is possible in a constitution what kind of country Canadians want, what values they cherish, and what objectives they seek.

To no inconsiderable degree this is a matter of reflecting in the Constitution what kind of nation Canada is: a free people in a free society; a country characterized by rich diversity, in linguistic communities, cultural heritages, and regional identities; a country where individual fulfilment is the fundamental goal of society; and a country where individual Canadians look to the state not simply as a vehicle by which to serve their own self-interest, but as a vehicle by which they can contribute to the well-being of other Canadians.

The Constitution ought also to reflect, in its statement of objectives, what Canadians expect of their country in the future: a country which will preserve its essential characteristics while accepting and nourishing the dynamics of change; a country which seeks both to enlarge and to make more nearly equal the opportunities available to all Canadians, wherever they live and whatever their background; and a country which seeks to contribute to the well-being of the peoples of the world, as well as to the interests of its own citizens. These are the perspectives which the federal government would hope to see in any statement of objectives for the Constitution of Canada.

We can readily understand why agreement on a specific text of a preamble cannot be easily reached. Like any other part of the Constitution the version finally accepted will require give-and-take on the part of all governments in Canada. We feel, however, that the necessary drafting skills and the necessary political will to make the preamble a reality exist. The road to a preamble is not impassable, only difficult.

We feel that the preamble to the new Canadian Constitution should include these basic objectives for Canada:

1. To establish a federal system of government within a democratic society;
2. To protect and enhance basic human rights;
3. To develop Canada as a bilingual and multicultural country in which all its citizens, male and female, young and old, native peoples and Métis, and all groups from every ethnic origin feel equally at home;

4. To promote economic, social and cultural equality for all Canadians as individuals and to reduce regional economic disparities;

5. To present Canada as a pluralistic mosaic, a free and open society which challenges the talents of her people;

6. To seek world peace and security, and international social progress.

The details of our recommendations in connection with the Preamble are set out below, particularly in recommendations 6, 10, 27, 29, 30, 31 and 32.

PART II—THE PEOPLE

Chapter 7—Self-Determination

RECOMMENDATIONS

6. The preamble of the Constitution should recognize that the Canadian federation is based on the liberty of the person and the protection of basic human rights as a fundamental and essential purpose of the State. Consequently, the preamble should also recognize that the existence of Canadian society rests on the free consent of its citizens and their collective will to live together, and that any differences among them should be settled by peaceful means.
7. If the citizens of a part of Canada at some time democratically declared themselves in favour of political arrangements which were contrary to the continuation of our present political structures, the disagreement should be resolved by political negotiation, not by the use of military or other coercive force.
8. We reaffirm our conviction that all of the peoples of Canada can achieve their aspirations more effectively within a federal system, and we believe Canadians should strive to maintain such a system.

The principle of self-determination, while not entirely new in Canadian history, has had a new currency in Quebec since 1960.

Some Quebecers, even while opting for a renewed federalism, see a recognition of self-determination as a strengthening of democracy, as a kind of guarantee of freedom for their political options. Others demand recognition of the right because they want recognition of their present political option: the separation of Quebec from Canada. Their major spokesman, the Parti Québécois, has made the exercise of right of self-determination the corner-stone of its creed.

On the world scene, the right of self-determination for nations was used in the settlement after the First World War, and was enshrined in Chapter I, Article 1 of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco in 1945: "... respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples." Most of the former colonies, particularly in Africa, have invoked that Charter provision to claim and gain independence. In addition, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in 1966, which affirmed the principle as follows: "All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely

determine their political status and freely pursue their economic social and cultural development." (Article 1). U Thant, while Secretary-General of the United Nations, took the position that membership in the United Nations establishes beyond question the fulfilment of self-determination for the peoples of a State.

The right to secede as an expression of self-determination is not generally recognized in federal constitutions.

The majority of definitions of 'nation' or 'people' by political scientists stress four conditions: a largely homogeneous population, a common language, a common territory and a common history. In examining the demographic map of Canada, we can perhaps find a number of nations in this sociological sense. However, in practical terms the problem focusses on Quebec, and this gives rise to the question of the relationship between self-determination for a people and self-determination for a province. In our view, the two are not equivalent, since the former is a natural entity and the latter an artificial one.

The French-Canadian people is not coextensive with the boundaries of the Province of Quebec. On the one hand, the nation extends beyond the boundaries of the Province into eastern and northern Ontario and northern New Brunswick. On the other hand, there are within the Province of Quebec other groups which would possess an equal claim with Francophones to self-determination: we refer, for instance to the one million Anglophones, who at least in the western part of the province have sufficient geographic cohesion to constitute viable communities. Thus, even if we accepted the view that the contiguous French-speaking community of Canada were a "people" with the right of self-determination, we can see no feasible legal formula for self-determination on the basis of provincial boundaries.

We are therefore of the view that it would rather be appropriate to recognize self-determination as a right belonging to people. Hence we recommend that the preamble of the Constitution should recognize that the Canadian federation is based on the liberty of the person and the protection of fundamental human rights as a fundamental and essential purpose of the State. Consequently, the preamble should also recognize that the existence of Canadian society rests on the free consent of its citizens and their collective will to live together, and that any disagreements should be settled by peaceful means.

The constitutional considerations we have advanced would not in our view predetermine the response of a Federal Government which might be confronted with a clear majority of a total provincial electorate in favour of independence. For such a case we advocate negotiation and reject the use of military or other coercive force. We cannot imagine that any Federal Government would use force to prevent the secession of a region which had clearly and deliberately decided by a majority of the total

electorate to leave Confederation. But the reluctant acceptance of a *fait accompli* is a matter for political bargaining rather than for constitutional drafting.

In conclusion, we reaffirm our conviction that all of the peoples of Canada can achieve their aspirations more effectively within a federal system, and we believe that Canadians should strive to maintain such a system.

Chapter 8—Native Peoples

RECOMMENDATIONS

9. No constitutional changes concerning native peoples should be made until such time as their own organizations have completed their research into the question of treaty and aboriginal rights in Canada.
10. The preamble of the new Constitution should affirm the special place of native peoples, including Métis, in Canadian life.
11. Provincial governments should, where the population is sufficient, consider recognizing Indian languages as regional languages.
12. No jurisdictional changes should be made in administrative arrangements concerning Indians and Eskimos without consultation with them.

The legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada over native peoples comes from section 91(24) of the British North America Act. This heading of legislative power is in the following terms: "Indians, and Lands Reserved for the Indians." The courts have included Eskimos in the definition of 'Indians'. We heard evidence across Canada from native peoples in almost every province and territory, from their organizations and from individuals. We also heard from many other Canadians who were, almost without exception, very sympathetic to the hopes and aspirations of the native peoples of Canada.

There is already a Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Our limited function is to assess the constitutional position of native peoples. In a sense it is somewhat arbitrary to separate the constitutional aspects of the status of native peoples from the very real and often stark plight in which many of them find themselves. Witnesses from the native peoples opened the eyes of the Committee to the need to do justice to these "first Canadians". Certainly we were moved by the eloquence and obvious sincerity of the many witnesses, both native peoples and other Canadians, who pleaded this cause. Generally, the mood of native peoples was positive about their role in the future of Canada. But this attitude of optimism was tempered by the hard realities of the life many native peoples are forced to lead. The attribution of blame for this condition is not so important as the recognition of its existence. In this context the words of a native peoples' witness are most apt:

We are a people with special rights guaranteed us by promises and treaties. We do not beg for these rights, nor do we thank you. We do not thank you for them because we paid for them, and God help us, the price we paid was exorbitant. We paid for them, with our culture, our dignity, our pride and self-respect. We paid, we paid and we paid until we became a beaten and poverty-stricken race. (3.3:7)*

There are at least two general approaches to the constitutional position of native peoples. One is to view the native people as collectivities. Those who prefer to follow this approach, and it does appear preferable to many of the native peoples themselves, lay great stress on treaty rights and aboriginal rights. This approach, generally envisions two positions: (1) individual or collective legal claims for treaty and aboriginal rights enforceable in the courts; and (2) solemn undertakings of the people of Canada to the native peoples as matters of justice and equity between two collectivities. The native peoples are now in the process of discovering through community awareness and research the extent of their legal and equitable claims against the Government of Canada.

Some Canadians, on the other hand, favour a "Bill of Rights approach". This would guarantee to the native peoples equality before the law and protection against discrimination based on their race or creed. Some witnesses favoured this; others criticized it as a strictly egalitarian approach. They maintained that what the native peoples require, certainly for the foreseeable future, is equality-plus, or as one witness referred to it, "citizen-plus". While it may be theoretically arguable that equality as a principle might be violated by any notion of different status for native peoples, the history of our present constitution indicates that Indians and Eskimos (as a class of people) have already been in a unique legislative position under the B.N.A. Act for one hundred and four years. In any event, it is difficult to see how Indians, broadly speaking, have any real equality with white men in relation to the total social dimension in which they live. To advocate the possibility to even greater real injustice in the name of a formal, legal equality would be folly.

*These references refer to the Committee's Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence. The first number refers to the session of the 28th Parliament, the second to the issue number of the Minutes and the third to the page in that issue.

Several witnesses indicated to the Committee that insofar as purely legal considerations are concerned Indian rights may vary considerably across Canada. Broadly speaking, the mechanism of treaties was used for Indians to surrender or extinguish their rights to the land in most of Western Canada and nearly all of Ontario. On the other hand, this technique was not followed in British Columbia, Eastern Canada, or the Territories. One possibility suggested to us was "different options . . . for different groups, for instance, treaty Indians and non-treaty Indians." (3.88:22)

We were heartened by the growing political consciousness of native peoples, and their attempts to deal with their problems through their own organizations. In fact, our major recommendation in this field springs from the Committee's acceptance of a major theme of virtually all briefs presented by native peoples' organizations and many of those by individual native peoples. The National Indian Brotherhood told us:

It is thus obvious that any changes in the Constitution affecting Section 91(24) or even other classes of subjects will have an effect on the Indian People of Canada. The Indian people not only have particular rights which are presently recognized under the Constitution but submit that they have certain rights which must be protected.

The Indian People, however, agree that the situation has evolved. New problems have arisen, and a change has taken and is taking place among the Indians. But they must control their destiny. They must participate in determining their constitutional status.

However, we are not yet in a position to recommend in its entirety the proper legal framework for our development as a people.

The issues at stake are far too important for unprepared or unwise action. Aware of the principle that they themselves must forge their destiny, the Indian people must be given the time to assess not only in legal terms but in social and modern terms who they are, what they have and where they want to go before any action which will dramatically affect these considerations, including constitutional change, is taken.

The Indian people have established research committees in each province and territory precisely to thoroughly investigate and research Indian Rights and Treaties. A National Committee on Indian Rights and Treaties, a committee of the National Indian Brotherhood, has also been established.

The objective of these research committees is to thoroughly document all Indian rights, treaty and non-treaty and enable the Indian people to make decisions as to their future with adequate and factual knowledge of their rights.

To require us to act in any definitive sense in regard to the Constitution at this point, therefore, is premature and unfair. To act without decisions from the Indian people in regard to their future is unacceptable.

We need time and this is the central message of this brief (3.88:56).

The Committee therefore recommends that there be no constitutional change made with respect to section 91(24) of the B.N.A. Act, concerning "Indians, and Lands Reserved for the Indians", until such time as the native peoples' organizations have completed their research and study into the whole question of treaty and aboriginal rights in Canada. We were told by the National Indian Brotherhood, as one of the native peoples' organizations involved, that it might be ready to come forward with recommendations early in 1972. We feel confident that, with the new sense of direction and urgency imbuing native peoples' organizations, their recommendations will be made within a reasonable time. At that time the Government of Canada should enter into extensive consultations with the native peoples before any change is made in legislative jurisdiction over them.

We also recommend that the native peoples of Canada, including Métis, be recognized in the preamble of the new Canadian Constitution as one of the groups composing the Canadian nation as a means of reaffirming the special obligation that Canadians feel towards the native peoples of this land.

We further recommend that, in view of the rising birth rate of native peoples, particularly in western Canada, Provincial Governments should, where native peoples are numerous enough, give consideration to making their languages regional languages. We shall consider the question of regional languages more fully below, but in this context we commend the recommendations made by the House of Commons' Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development as a practical first step towards preservation of the languages of the native peoples of Canada. That Committee recommended in its Fifth Report tabled in the House of Commons on June 30, 1971:

That the language of instruction at the pre-school level and up to the first or second year of primary school should be in the language of the local Indian or Eskimo community with secondary and tertiary languages English and/or French being introduced gradually through the pre-school and primary period and that courses linked to the local Indian or Eskimo culture continue to be taught in the local language throughout the primary level of school.

That decisions regarding the initial languages of instruction and the timing of introduction of secondary and tertiary languages should only be made after consultation with, and clear approval from a majority of parents in the communities concerned. (*Votes and Proceedings*, June 30, 1971, p. 763).

The Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development also made some 15 other recommendations which we endorse. Some of these favour, in general terms, programs like advancing pre-school instruction of Indian and Eskimo children to the three-year-old level; encouraging local day schools rather than residential ones; providing for flexibility in the timing of vacations; allowing, where possible, boarding students to get home for Christmas; and gearing vocational programs to the needs of the areas in which young native people live. These recommendations, some of which are already part of Federal Government policy, are designed to meet a problem in native peoples' education which the Standing Committee described in these terms:

Something was drastically and basically deficient in an education system or systems with a school drop-out rate of more than four times the national average serving a population of which 40% to 50% of the adult males were unemployed or underemployed, and of which an even higher percentage of young people, in some communities 80% to 90%, were unemployed for a good part of the year (*ibid.* p. 761).

In addition to these administrative and legislative suggestions of the Standing Committee we would like to draw attention to two specific recommendations of that Committee with broadly constitutional implications:

That the Government should continue its policy that no transfers of education programs from the federal level to provincial systems take place without the express and clear approval of the majority of the parents in each community concerned. (*ibid.* p. 763).

We wish to make it perfectly clear that we are not recommending how any programs should be transferred, if, indeed, any should be transferred at all. The other recommendation of the Standing Committee was:

That all curriculums [sic] within the federal program be revised to include:

a) substantially more Indian history including Indian contributions to the economy, science, medicine, agriculture, exploration, etc.

b) special courses in Indian culture, music, art, handicrafts, etc. and that pressure be brought upon the respective provincial systems to inaugurate similar reforms wherever Indian children are being taught (*ibid.*)

We agree with these views.

We were also advised by many witnesses representing the Métis people of Canada that they consider themselves in a sort of cultural and constitutional "no man's land". Neither white nor Indian, neither a Federal nor a Provincial legislative responsibility, they told us they suffered from social ostracism because of their race, and administrative indifference because of their legal status. As one Métis witness put it:

We are presently too disadvantaged culturally and socially to be able to avail ourselves of the opportunities available, and we want to correct this inequity. Sociologically, culturally and ethnically the majority of Métis have a strong Indian identity, and other than in legal terms most of us are as much Indian as those who are covered by treaty. At the same time, we do not enjoy the advantages of treaty Indians and suffer all the disadvantages since we share a poverty culture. (2.9:122).

While there are many legal niceties involved in the problem of the social, cultural, biological and ethnic definition of a Métis, we prefer to see the problem, constitutionally, in broader terms. We believe a recognition of native peoples ought to be included in the preamble of a new constitution, and that 'native peoples' in this context should expressly include Métis. This is not to specify that Métis should necessarily be treated identically with Indians and Eskimos in all respects, but rather to indicate that they too have a right to special care and attention by Canadians.

In many respects the native peoples of Canada are a test of Canadian society: a test of its compassion to reach out for new and deeper values of tolerance and friendship; a test of its laws to do justice to the weak and the few; a test of its willingness to share the nation's wealth, and to give equality of opportunity a chance, freedom a new birth, and self respect a new home in the minds and hearts of Canada's native peoples.

Chapter 9—Fundamental Rights

RECOMMENDATIONS

13. Canada should have a Bill of Rights entrenched in the Constitution, guaranteeing the political freedoms of conscience and religion, of thought, opinion and expression, of peaceful assembly and of association.
14. The Bill of Rights should include a provision requiring fair and equitable representation in the House of Commons and in the Provincial Legislatures.
15. The right to citizenship, once legally acquired, should be made inalienable under the Bill of Rights.
16. The individual person should be constitutionally protected in his life, liberty and the security of his person so as not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.
17. The individual person should be constitutionally protected against the arbitrary seizure of his property, except for the public good and for just compensation.
18. The Constitution should prohibit discrimination by reason of sex, race, ethnic origin, colour or religion by proclaiming the right of the individual to equal treatment by law.
19. Discrimination in employment, or in membership in professional, trade or other occupational associations, or in obtaining public accommodation and services, or in owning, renting or holding property should also be declared contrary to the Bill of Rights.
20. Other provisions already contained in the Canadian Bill of Rights (1960) protecting legal rights should also be included in the Constitutional Bill of Rights: protection against unreasonable searches and seizures, the right to be informed promptly of the reason for arrest, the right to counsel, the right to habeas corpus, protection against self-crimination, the right to a fair hearing, the right to be presumed innocent and not to be denied reasonable bail without just cause, the right to an interpreter, the proscribing of retroactive penal laws or punishments, and the right not to be subjected to cruel and unusual punishment.
21. The rights and freedoms recognized by the Bill of Rights should not be interpreted as absolute and

unlimited, but should rather be exercisable to the extent that they are reasonably justifiable in a democratic society.

The Committee endorses the agreement of the governments of Canada to entrench in the Constitution certain basic political rights (Articles 1 to 9 of the Victoria Charter) but urges that other rights also be included in a constitutional Bill of Rights.

No one in Canada seriously questions the necessity of protecting fundamental human rights such as those recognized in a limited way by the present legislative Canadian Bill of Rights, but some witnesses before the Committee took the position that such protection should be left entirely to the good faith of legislative bodies, since in a democracy they presumably reflect the prevailing popular will. In plain words the argument was that we can do no better than to trust democracy.

The Committee believes that this argument would identify democracy with the majority opinion of the moment, and that the true interests of democracy do not lie in such a facile identification with every majority. What democracy requires is that a continuing popular majority must prevail, and it is by no means inconsistent with democracy to erect safeguards to ensure that a majority is a continuing one before it may be allowed to interfere with certain long-established rights. Democracy cannot lose by being forced to have second thoughts on some matters of great moment; in fact this is the rationale of the power which our system of government gives to opposition parties to delay government legislative programs.

It is true that an entrenched Bill of Rights must be interpreted by courts, and one can theoretically proceed to an infinite regression as to which has the final word, a court which has the right to interpret what a legislature enacts or a legislature which has the right to amend a judicial interpretation. But in reality courts in a democratic society always eventually accept what the majority wants, if only because the political representatives of the majority will ensure that judicial appointees share their philosophy. Moreover, the legislative process of reversal of judicial interpretation through constitutional amendment, though cumbersome, is also assured to the majority.

We admit that an entrenched Bill of Rights would limit legislative sovereignty, but then parliamentary sovereignty is no more sacrosanct a principle than is the respect for human liberty which is reflected in a Bill of Rights. Legis-

lative sovereignty is already limited legally by the distribution of powers under a federal system and, some would say, by natural law or by a common-law Bill of Rights. The kind of additional limit on it which would be imposed by a constitutional Bill of Rights is not an absolute one, for a Bill of Rights constitutes rather a healthy tension point between two principles of fundamental value, establishing the kind of equilibrium among the competing interests of majority rule and minority rights which is in our view of the essence of democracy.

We do not agree with the allegation that the proposal for a Bill of Rights conceals a hidden enlargement of Federal powers. Indeed, we believe that Federal jurisdiction is more likely to be expanded by the judiciary in the absence of a Bill of Rights. The Federal criminal law power, for instance, has been considerably bolstered in recent years by courts which have had no other way of striking down provincial laws they considered unfair to individuals than by bestowing jurisdiction on the Federal Parliament. The fact is that the losers in the "power game" under a Bill of Rights are the totality of governments and the winners are the people. For us, this is as it should be.

We see a Bill of Rights which is entrenched in the Constitution serving as a guarantee to individuals that democracy does not mean ruthless uniformity, as a symbol to minorities that their reasonable autonomy will be respected, and as a sign to the whole people of a wholesome rationality in a world often given to a ceaseless struggle for power.

The fundamental rights which the governments of Canada have agreed to entrench in the Constitution are the following:

freedom of thought, conscience and religion,

freedom of opinion and expression, and freedom of peaceful assembly and of association

(Article 1 of the Victoria Charter)

We would have preferred not to have freedom of thought linked solely with freedom of conscience and religion, since it actually has (and presumably is intended to have) a wider application, and as located it might run afoul of the *ejusdem generis* (same genus) rule of interpretation. We believe it should rather be linked with freedom of opinion and expression.

We note the absence of any specific reference to freedom of the press, presumably on the ground that it is merely a special case of the freedom of expression. That seems to us to be its appropriate location, since we do not see the press as having special rights beyond those of ordinary citizens.

Articles 4 to 8 of the Victoria Charter establish the principles of universal suffrage, free democratic elections, five-year maximum terms and annual sessions for the House of Commons and the Legislatures, and the right not to be discriminated against either as an elector or as a legislator. However, at the theoretical level these rights are not complete without the right to representation on the basis of population, and at the practical level there is a need for a guarantee of this right in Canada, since most Provincial Legislatures do not give adequate representation to urban residents. As a consequence, urban residents across Canada feel that their needs are being

neglected by their Provincial Governments, and in their frustration are demanding action by the Federal Government to solve their problems. Such popular demands for Federal action in fields of Provincial responsibility threaten to undermine the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures, and a constitutional guarantee of representation on the basis of population in the Legislatures would thus be in the Provincial interest.

We regard this matter so seriously that we strongly urge the inclusion of a provision for fair representation in the Bill of Rights. As we see it, it would assist in the preservation of the Provinces as strong entities. We believe it is also important that the Federal Government be relieved of the psychological pressure to solve problems which functionally or otherwise belong at the Provincial level.

Of course, the standard to be applied in the determination of fair representation need not be an absolute one. The variation of 20 per cent from the quantitative norm which is tolerated by present Federal law is probably justifiable in a large country with a small population, but the 40 per cent divergence of population which it allows between the most and the least populous constituencies seems to us to be about the maximum desirable. All of the Provinces have such small population densities that an absolute standard of equality would prevent proper servicing of rural districts by their elected representatives. At present, however, the injustice appears to us to work the other way.

The one unfortunate result of a constitutional standard of fair and equitable representation might be the unrestricted assumption by the judiciary of the setting of standards of fair representation, with consequent uncertainty in the legislative process. This could be avoided by establishing in the Constitution a standard of, say, 20 per cent, as the maximum permissible variation from the norm. Any Bill of Rights guarantee of "rep by pop" would have, of course, to be made subject to other constitutional provisions protecting minimal provincial representation in the Federal Parliament.

Another omission from the Victoria Charter relates to citizenship. In Canada, a nation of immigrants, it is entirely fitting that the Constitution should provide that citizenship, once legally acquired, should be inalienable.

There are other unfortunate omissions from the Charter. They are especially striking because they derogate from the proposals for a constitutional Bill of Rights presented by the Government of Canada in 1969, and from the safeguards in the present Canadian Bill of Rights. We have in mind guarantees of procedural justice concerning the right of the person to life, liberty, and the security of his person and of his property.

We should like to avoid the use of the phrase "due process of law" entirely, because it is a phrase which has no tradition in our law, despite its incorporation in the 1960 Bill of Rights, and because of its unfortunate interpretation in the United States under substantive due process. At its worst this phrase gave judges leeway to substitute their socio-economic views for those of legislatures. In our view it is more desirable to use another phrase found in the Canadian Bill of Rights, "the principles of fundamental justice." We therefore propose the following guarantee:

The right of the individual person to life, liberty, and security of his person, and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

We would also add a protection against arbitrary seizure of property. In order to allow the maximum latitude for economic decisions by legislatures, we would protect the individual person only where his property was taken contrary to the public good or without just compensation. Our proposal is as follows:

The right of the individual person to the enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the public good and for just compensation.

All of these rights are classed, both by the Canadian Bill of Rights and by the Federal constitutional proposals, among political rather than legal rights. In our view they are genuinely political rights, because they are necessary for the preservation of democratic society, and for the fostering of its highest ideals. None is legal in the sense of being limited to court processes, as are the strictly legal rights. Even if the governments of Canada should decide not to include legal protections in the Bill of Rights, in our view the rights to life, liberty, and the reasonable enjoyment of property should be guaranteed as fundamental human rights.

We also believe it essential that the Bill of Rights state that no person shall receive unequal treatment by reason of sex, race, colour, ethnic origin or religion. Many witnesses who appeared before us argued convincingly for equal treatment for women before and in the law and its administration. We also received many representations by native peoples about various forms of racial and ethnic discrimination. The Bill of Rights in a new Canadian Constitution should render any discrimination in the legal system unconstitutional, by prescribing positively:

the right of the individual person to equal treatment by the law.

A large area of the discrimination against all these groups of Canadians lies in the area of private morality and individual mores. To the extent that Bill of Rights provisions can give a focus to the spirit of tolerance and egalitarianism in our country, they can help to break down the barriers of ignorance and contempt which are the breeding grounds of discrimination. Such provisions would leave no doubt that Canadians generally do not share the views of any individual Canadian who treats his compatriots in a way inconsistent with the tolerance and respect which is their due as people. We therefore propose the following constitutional provision:

Every individual in Canada is entitled not to be discriminated against by reason of sex, race, colour, ethnic origin or religion

- (a) in employment or in membership in any professional, trade or other occupational association;
- (b) in obtaining public accommodation, facilities and services;
- (c) in owning, renting, holding or otherwise possessing property.

The full control of discrimination practised by private citizens would necessitate the supplementing of such constitutional provisions with ordinary legislation at both Federal and Provincial levels.

We also strongly recommend the inclusion in a Bill of Rights of other basic legal rights such as those already contained in the Canadian Bill of Rights. We adopt the formulation of these rights in the Federal Government's constitutional proposals put forward in *The Constitution and the People of Canada* at page 52:

(a) the right of the individual to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures;

(b) the right of a person who has been arrested or detained

(i) to be informed promptly of the reason for his arrest or detention

(ii) to retain and instruct counsel without delay, and

(iii) to the remedy by way of habeas corpus for the determination of the validity of his detention and for his release if the detention is not lawful;

(c) the right of a person not to give evidence before any court, tribunal, commission, board or other authority if he is denied counsel, protection against self-crimination, or other constitutional safeguards;

(d) the right of a person to a fair hearing in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice for the determination of his rights and obligations;

(e) the right of a person charged with an offence to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a fair hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, and the right not to be denied reasonable bail without just cause;

(f) the right of a person to the assistance of an interpreter in any proceedings in which he is involved as a party or witness, before a court, commission, board or other tribunal, if he does not understand or speak the language in which such proceedings are conducted;

(g) the right of a person not to be held guilty of an offence on account of any act or omission which at the time of its commission or omission did not constitute an offence, and the right of a person on being found guilty of an offence not to be subjected to a penalty heavier than the one applicable at the time the offence was committed;

(h) the right of a person not to be subjected to cruel and unusual treatment or punishment.

We believe that these traditional legal rights are sufficiently well accepted by our society not to require any special defence as human rights. We presume that the only question is whether they are better protected constitutionally or legislatively. We have already stated our general position that constitutional protection is necessary.

Just as important as these guarantees of fair legal process is the provision of legal advice and legal counsel to those who cannot otherwise afford them. Although there

has been a growing awareness across the country of the acute need in this field, the majority of Provinces still do not have publicly supported programs of legal aid which are generally available. It is our hope that the initiative which the Federal Government has recently taken in establishing a legal aid program in the Northwest Territories will be followed elsewhere and expanded everywhere. We would particularly stress that the disadvantaged in our society need counselling as well as counsel, and that an adequate program of legal assistance will ensure that this need is met, through the development of direct governmental services, if necessary. Nevertheless, since the provision of adequate legal services necessitates the development of a considerable program of implementation, we cannot recommend it for inclusion in a Bill of Rights: for a constitutional charter of liberties must needs have a primarily negative thrust, by way of protecting people against an excess of governmental power. The providing of positive benefits is rather the stuff of ordinary legislation.

We have reservations with respect to the general qualification on the fundamental freedoms in Article 3 of the Victoria Charter. That article would allow:

such limitations on the exercise of the fundamental

freedoms as are reasonably justifiable in a democratic society in the interests of public safety, order, health or morals, of national security or of the rights and freedoms of others.

Even in the absence of such words, any court would surely read general guarantees of liberties as subject to some restrictions, and we agree with the Charter that it is preferable to have such limitations as officially enacted provisions of the Constitution rather than as roughly formulated propositions in judicial minds. The fact that the limitations are thus made explicit ought also to eliminate the simplistic argument that rights are absolute. In order to focus the principle of judicial interpretation more clearly, however, we would prefer to state any such qualification more rather than less generally. We would therefore recommend that any limitations on the exercise of the fundamental freedoms should be only such "as are reasonably justifiable in a democratic society" without any further specification.

A number of witnesses addressed us on matters connected with the use of exceptional government powers in emergency situations. We take the view that it is preferable to have this problem solved more generally, according to the formula we have just suggested.

Chapter 10—Language Rights

RECOMMENDATIONS

22. French and English should be constitutionally entrenched as the two official languages of Canada.
23. The Constitution should recognize:
 - (a) the right of any person to use either official language in the Federal and Provincial Legislatures and the Territorial Councils;
 - (b) the right to have access in both official languages to the legislative records, journals, and enactments of Canada, New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec and the Territories;
 - (c) the right to use either official language in dealing with judicial or quasi-judicial Federal bodies or with courts in New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec and the Territories;
 - (d) the right to communicate in either official language with Federal departments and agencies and with provincial departmental head offices or agency head offices in New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec and the Territories.
24. All of the rights in recommendation 23 (b) (c) and (d) should also be exercisable in:
 - (a) any Province where each language is the mother tongue of ten per cent of the population;
 - (b) in any Province where the legislature declares French and English the official languages of the Province.
25. The Constitution should recognize parents' right to have English or French provided as their child's main language of instruction in publicly supported schools in areas where the language of their choice is chosen by a sufficient number of persons to justify the provision of the necessary facilities.
26. We support the general objective of making French the working language in Quebec. We hope that through the studies being carried out in Quebec on this matter, this objective can be reached with due respect for certain Quebec Anglophone institutions, and taking into account the North American and world reality.
27. The preamble to the Constitution should formally recognize that Canada is a multicultural country.

28. The Constitution should explicitly recognize the right of Provincial Legislatures to confer equivalent status with the English and French languages on other languages. Federal financial assistance to support the teaching or use of other languages would be appropriate.

The ethnic origin of the Canadian population as of the 1961 census, when the total population was 18,200,000, was as follows: British, almost 8 million or 43.85 per cent; French, more than 5,540,000 or 30.38 per cent; other origins, more than 4,700,000 or 25.77 per cent. Among the other origins the predominant were German, with slightly more than 1 million or 5.75 per cent; Ukrainian, with just under 475,000 or 2.59 per cent; and Italian, with 450,000 or 2.47 per cent. It is interesting to note that the French proportion of the population has remained almost constant since 1871, declining from 31.07 per cent in that year only to 30.38 per cent in 1961, whereas the British proportion declined from 60.55 per cent in 1871 to 43.85 per cent in 1961. The great increase, of course, has come in the category of other ethnic groups, rising from 8.38 per cent in 1871 to 25.77 per cent in 1961. It is expected the 1971 census figures will show a further increase in the percentage of Canadians who are neither British nor French, largely at the expense of the British proportion.

The only substantive language provision of the British North America Act is section 133:

Either the English or the French Language may be used by any Person in the Debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those Languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those Languages may be used by any Person or in any Pleading or Process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the Courts of Quebec.

The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those Languages.

Section 133 establishes equal rights for the use of English and French in certain circumstances, but does not establish any official languages for Canada. Undoubtedly the presumption of the Fathers of Confederation was that English would be the majority language, but it was not

given any official status by the Act. Nor was any such status conferred on the French language.

Constitutionally speaking, then, Canada has no official language. By section 133 English and French both have a limited status: with respect to the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Quebec and in the courts established under the authority of these bodies. In addition, the Official Languages Act passed in 1969 by the Parliament of Canada provides that:

The English and French languages are the official languages of Canada *for all purposes of the Parliament and Government of Canada*, and possess and enjoy equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all the institutions of the Parliament and Government of Canada (emphasis added).

Parliament does not have the power under section 91(1) of the British North America Act to amend section 133 so as to establish the two languages as official for all purposes without qualification.

Undoubtedly the Official Languages Act psychologically prepared the country for a constitutional recognition of English and French as the two official languages of Canada, and the experience of this Committee indicates that there is now majority support in every part of Canada for such a step. Not only did the testimony of the great majority of witnesses before the Committee, including those representing other language groups, support or accept two official languages, but, with rare exceptions, audience reaction was strongly hostile to expressions of opposition to either official language.

To our minds it is fitting that these two languages should be recognized as official languages. The use of English is so general in the life of our country and it is so much the language of work for most of the people of North America that its designation can be assumed to be non-controversial. But the historical and contemporary claims of the French language to similar recognition are also great. French was not only the first European language spoken in the territory of Canada, but it has been also the language of such a large number of the inhabitants of the country that it can be described as one of the two original languages, whichever one of the stages in our legal evolution is taken as the real beginning of Canada: the Royal Proclamation of 1763, the Quebec Act of 1774, the Constitutional Act of 1791, the Union Act of 1840, or the British North America Act of 1867. It is the majority language of our second most populous Province—the only Province to have a majority language other than English—and is by far the second most spoken language in Canada, being the mother tongue of roughly one third of our citizens. Not only does it have a factual status which no other minority language has, but it has a special status, along with English, in the life of the country. The Committee, therefore, endorses the position stated in Article 10 of the Victoria Charter that English and French should be the official languages of Canada.

The principle granted, there nevertheless remains the determination of its scope. As we have said, the extent of the use of English and French legally required by section 133 of the present B.N.A. Act is limited to the Federal Parliament and Courts and the Quebec Legislature and Courts. This leads us to the belief that under the proposed new amending formula this section would be repealable

by those two legislatures alone, as the only legislatures concerned.

The Victoria Charter does not propose a general substitute for section 133. We hope, however, that section 133 will be replaced by an expanded guarantee of the two languages, which would involve all the provinces and thus render moot the question of how many provinces would have to consent to amend the present section 133. Fairness requires that other provinces be as generous in recognizing the rights of their French-speaking citizens as Quebec has been in protecting those of its English-speaking residents.

As a minimum, the Constitution should recognize and guarantee with respect to the English and French languages:

- (1) the right of every person to the use of either language in the Parliament of Canada, in the Legislatures of all the Provinces, and in the Territorial Councils;
- (2) the right of every person to have access, in both languages, to records, journals and enactments of
 - (i) the Parliament of Canada,
 - (ii) the Legislatures of New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec,
 - (iii) the legislature of any province in which each language is the mother tongue of at least ten percent of the population,
 - (iv) the legislature of any province where that legislature has declared that English and French are the official languages of the province, and
 - (v) the Territorial Councils.

The Victoria Charter would also provide in Article 13 that:

The statutes of each Province shall be printed and published in English and French, and where the Government of a Province, prints and publishes its statutes in one only of the official languages, the Government of Canada shall print and publish them in the other official language . . .

We adopt this proposal for Federal publication, and would also add two additional rights:

- (1) the right of any person to use either language, without prejudice by reason of the language he employs, when appearing in or giving evidence in, or in any pleading or process in or issuing from
 - (i) any judicial or quasi-judicial body established by the Constitution or Parliament of Canada,
 - (ii) the courts of New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec, and the Territories.
 - (iii) the courts of any province in which each language is the mother tongue of at least ten percent of the population, and
 - (iv) the courts of any province in which the legislature has declared that English and French are the official languages of that province.

(2) the right of every person to communicate in either language

(i) with any department or agency of the Government of Canada, or of the Territories,

(ii) with the head office of every department and agency of the governments of New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec,

(iii) with the head office of every department and agency of the government of any province in which each language is the mother tongue of at least ten percent of the population,

(iv) with the head office of every department and agency of the government of any province in which the legislature has declared that English and French are the official languages of the province.

It is regrettable, in our view, that the Victoria Charter does not go this far. The right to the use of either language in their Legislatures was not accepted by the three most westerly Provinces. It would seem that no province would deny the right of any legislator actually to speak in French in the legislature, but three Provinces declined to recognize formally an existing privilege as a legal right.

It would be most unfortunate if that position continued to find support, since the only valid arguments for it can easily be met. On the one hand, the fear that such a provision could be interpreted to mean that the records, journals and enactments of all the legislatures would have to be made available by every Province in both languages, at its own expense, is eliminated by the language of the Charter. On the other hand, the concern that other linguistic groups might be alienated by such a Provincial recognition of the English or French languages could be obviated by the granting of equal Provincial rights to citizens of other language groups, a point we shall develop further below.

The case for granting French such status in the legislatures is not only that fairness demands equal treatment for the French language outside of Quebec with that which English receives within that Province, but especially that without it the two official languages might appear to be an empty symbol. If the Constitution establishes two official languages, it is reasonable to expect that it must somehow go beyond the language policy which has already been established by the Federal Parliament through ordinary legislation. In other words, it must in some way touch Provincial as well as Federal institutions. There is no more minimal way in which two official languages can affect the Provinces than by allowing French to be spoken in every Legislature. There is no obligation to listen. But it may still be important to a French-speaking legislator to speak in his officially-recognized language. It is our feeling that any Province which is not prepared to accept an official recognition of the right to speak both official languages in its legislature would put in question its sincerity in endorsing the principle that English and French shall be the official languages of Canada, a principle which all Provinces have already accepted.

We have already made it clear that we agree with the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism that New Brunswick and Ontario,

as the two Provinces with substantial proportions of French-speaking inhabitants, have special obligations with respect to the two languages. New Brunswick has accepted such obligations.

While we are in no position, as a Committee of the Federal Parliament, to make direct recommendations to Provincial Governments, we should like to express the hope that Ontario will be prepared to accept access in both languages to the records, journals, and enactments of its Legislature, and the use of either language when appearing in or giving evidence in its courts or in any pleading or process in or issuing from those courts. Since we realize that the financial burden imposed by these responsibilities might be considerable, though no greater than that which has been accepted by Quebec for more than a century, we suggest to the Federal Government that it consider the advisability of offering financial and technical assistance to New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec to enable all of them more effectively to serve their linguistic minorities.

We regret the absence of any statement in the Charter with respect to the language of education, and we endorse the earlier statement of the Constitutional Conference in February, 1971:

The individual shall have the right to have English or French as his main language of instruction in publicly supported schools in areas where the language of instruction of his choice is chosen by a sufficient number of persons to justify the provision of the necessary facilities.

Here there are both theoretical and practical problems. The theoretical problem is raised by the Province of Quebec, which apparently feels some reluctance to accept an unqualified right in parents to choose the language of instruction of their children, for fear that the supposed economic advantages of knowing English might tempt too many parents to choose education in English for their children.

We are fully conscious of the need of the Quebec Government to keep constantly in mind demographic and linguistic factors. Yet the fact appears to be that the French language in Canada has never been stronger. Even a well-known separatist witness before the Committee admitted that the French language is now so secure that Quebec's continuance within Canada would no longer pose any threat to it. More important, there are some matters in which a Government in a free society may not go beyond persuasion. In our view this is one such matter, and the right of parents to choose their children's education is a basic human right which no government can encroach upon.

We would add that, in our opinion, the spheres of trade and commerce and industry in Quebec constitute important fields of activity where the influence of the French language must be established and developed.

To this end we support the general objective of making French the working language in Quebec. Specific suggestions were made on language of work by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Reports 3A and 3B and we include the relevant recommendations in Appendix C.

We hope that through studies being carried out in Quebec on this matter, this objective can be achieved with due respect for Quebec Anglophone institutions and taking into account the North American and world reality. If French is established as the key language in the business world, the Government need not fear that it will not be chosen as a language of instruction by parents.

There are practical as well as theoretical problems in implementing any guarantee of choice of language in education. We believe, however, that, given good will, the practical difficulties can be overcome. We are confident that, over a period of years, every province would be able, with the aid of Federal grants, to achieve substantial progress for its linguistic minority.

We believe that the language question is one of the most important to be settled in a new Constitution. It is obviously of great symbolic importance. How can a French-speaking Canadian feel at home in Canada if the use of his language is effectively denied him everywhere but in Quebec? It is also of great practical importance, since it is a question of equal opportunity before the law and in the Federal administration.

Of course, the language question goes much beyond the Constitution. We have already discussed the effort of the Government of Quebec to establish French as the language of work in that Province. We have found across the country not only a sympathy towards the use of French, but a lively interest in learning to speak it, especially among younger Canadians, and we look forward confidently to the day when the proportion of bilingual Anglophones will be as high as that of bilingual Francophones. To this end we would encourage all young Canadians to learn both the English and French languages. But as far as the Constitution is concerned, we think it sufficient that the more limited recommendations we make here, be adopted. Of course, Parliament and the Legislatures should be free to "provide for more extensive use of English and French", as Article 18 of the Victoria Charter states.

Although we frankly accept the inherent limitations of constitutional provisions respecting languages, we are of the opinion that it is also important to give constitutional recognition to another Canadian linguistic fact, viz., other languages. There are large groups of Canadians who speak Ukrainian, German and Italian and smaller numbers who speak many other tongues, especially those of Eastern Europe. In the Prairie Provinces other languages are spoken more than French. Nearly one third of the Canadian people come from stock that is neither British nor French and is largely continental European. This third element has made a great contribution to the development of Canada in the years since Confederation, and it would be fitting to recognize it in the Constitution.

In our view a new Constitution should recognize in the preamble that Canada is multicultural rather than bicultural

or unicultural. As a fact this seems sufficiently obvious to any student of the country, but it is also a point which needs formal emphasis. There neither is, nor should there be, any official culture in Canada. One of the deepest aspects of our national character has been its cultural tolerance towards minority groups. Canadians do not feel the need to impose a common culture nor to divorce people from their cultural roots. All democracies allow their citizens freedom under law, but many do not go so far as to allow cultural freedom. Canada must continue to do so, but more consciously and more effectively.

The Constitution should therefore provide in its section on language rights that Provincial Legislatures may confer rights on other language groups with respect to use in the Legislatures themselves, or in government administration, the courts, and education in publicly-supported schools. The negative phrasing proposed in Article 19 of the Victoria Charter is not adequate.

Our recommendation would confer no additional rights upon the Provinces. By section 92(1) they already possess the power to amend their own constitutions (except as regards the office of Lieutenant-Governor), by section 92(4) they are granted jurisdiction over "the Establishment and Tenure of Provincial Offices and the Appointment and Payment of Provincial Officers", by section 92(14) they control the administration of justice in the province, and by section 93 they receive the power exclusively to make laws in relation to education. Nevertheless, we believe that there is a profound symbolic value in drawing attention to existing provincial powers in the part of the Constitution which specifically deals with language rights. At the same time as official status is being conferred upon the English and French languages, it should be made clear both that this does not confer any priority with respect to culture, and that the use of other languages is encouraged. We have already mentioned the possibility of special status for other languages in the Provincial Legislatures.

The number of other languages besides English and French and the diverse sizes and conditions of the groups which speak them preclude the possibility of establishing mandatory constitutional provisions for them. They are indeed regional rather than national languages, and it is therefore appropriate that the specific recognition they receive should be at the provincial level. At the same time, however, there should be an umbrella provision in the Constitution to give them their due acknowledgement as one of the constituent elements of our country, ethnically and linguistically. Moreover, where a Province confers a particular public right upon a language group, it would be appropriate for the Federal Government to provide a measure of financial assistance. By doing so, it would help the Provinces to provide a valuable public service to a group of citizens.

Chapter 11—Regional Disparities

RECOMMENDATIONS

29. The equitable distribution of income should be recognized in the preamble of the Constitution as a dynamic and humane objective of our social policy. Consequently, we agree with the principle stated in the Victoria Charter that:

The Parliament and Government of Canada and the Legislatures and Governments of the Provinces are committed to . . . the promotion of equality of opportunity and well being for all individuals in Canada.

30. We agree with the statement in the Victoria Charter that:

The Parliament and Government of Canada and the Legislatures and Governments of the Provinces are committed to . . . the assurance, as nearly as possible, that essential public services of reasonable quality are available to all individuals in Canada.

This objective should be recognized in the preamble of the Constitution.

31. The preamble of the Constitution should provide that every Canadian should have access to adequate Federal, Provincial and municipal services without having to bear a disproportionate tax burden because of the region in which he lives. This recommendation follows logically from our acceptance of the principle of equality of opportunity for all Canadians.

32. We completely accept the following objective as stated in the Victoria Charter:

The promotion of economic development to reduce disparities in the social and economic opportunities for all individuals in Canada wherever they may live.

As in the case of redistribution of income among individuals and for the same reasons, this objective should be recognized in the preamble of the Constitution.

In as vast and rich a country as Canada, it would have been fortuitous if the wealth had been equally distributed among the various regions. Canadians are becoming aware of the problem of regional disparities and have

been asking their governments for increasingly greater redistribution of wealth. The Canadian Constitution did not explicitly assign this role to any government, but, through its spending power, the Parliament of Canada has been in a position to meet these needs.

In recent constitutional discussions, the question of regional disparities has been approached by governments through the concept of equal opportunity for all Canadians. Indeed, the First Ministers have reached a consensus on the concept of equal opportunity or equal future prospects.

The statement of conclusions of the third working session of the Constitutional Conference held in Ottawa on February 8 and 9, 1971, stated: "the First Ministers agreed that the Constitution should include a recognition of the importance of granting equality of opportunity to all Canadians. It was therefore concluded that the reduction of regional disparities should be referred to both in a new preamble and in the body of the Constitution."

The statement of conclusions then proceeded to specify what should be mentioned in the preamble and in the body of the Constitution itself in respect of regional disparities. Article 46 of the Victoria Charter, a section proposed for inclusion in the body of the Constitution was worded in the following terms:

The Parliament and Government of Canada and the Legislatures and Governments of the Provinces are committed to:

- (1) the promotion of equality of opportunity and well-being for all individuals in Canada;
- (2) the assurance, as far as possible, that essential public services of reasonable quality are available to all individuals in Canada; and
- (3) the promotion of economic development to reduce disparities in the social and economic opportunities for all individuals in Canada wherever they may live.

Article 47 of the Victoria Charter makes an important qualification to the provisions of Article 46:

The provisions of this Part shall not have the effect of altering the distribution of powers and shall not compel the Parliament of Canada or Legislatures of the Provinces to exercise their legislative powers.

We endorse the conclusions of the First Ministers concerning regional disparities and we believe that Canadians fully support these objectives and want to have them included in the Canadian Constitution. Considering the nature of these objectives, we recommend that they be included in the preamble of the Constitution. Otherwise, further provisions would have to be inserted to limit the scope of the various sections, as was the case in Article 47 of the Victoria Charter.

Equal opportunity must exist for every Canadian. This does not mean that every individual must have the same wealth or income but, rather, that there will be equal opportunities which will foster the development and well-being of groups of individuals. Regional disparities are a bar to achieving equal opportunity for all Canadians. Hence, equal opportunity must eliminate the possibility of disparities that arise from belonging to a particular group (region, province, race, language, etc.).

It is important, first of all, to differentiate between policies whose aim is to redistribute income among individuals and those designed to achieve equal opportunity for all Canadians. In order to achieve vertical equity the governments of Canada redistribute income among individuals so as to reduce disparities in the income scale of Canadians. This goal is being reached through a progressive system of taxation, through expenditures for goods and public services offered equally to all Canadians, and through certain transfer payments such as old age pensions and family allowances which provide assistance to needy citizens. This redistribution has an indirect effect on the distribution of income among regions, but the prime concern is still the individual as a citizen of Canada and not as a resident of a particular region. There is no question here of equalizing opportunities but merely of reducing income disparities, and the extent to which the latter remain depends on what is deemed acceptable by Canadians at a given time. We know what Canadians regard as equitable today, but we also know that vertical equity in future may call for greater or lesser redistribution.

In accordance with the principle expressed in the Victoria Charter, it does not seem wise to us to try to specify in the Constitution the form or degree of redistribution of income. Social priorities and principles cannot be fixed at any specific time. We therefore recommend that the objective of achieving a fair redistribution of income be included in the preamble of the Constitution, and that it reflect the social conscience of Canadians and our own approach to social problems.

Actually it is at the regional or provincial level that equality of opportunity can best be applied. Here the redistribution of wealth can be used to equalize the financial capacities of the regional governments or reduce discrepancies in the economic potential of the various regions.

Governments ensure horizontal equity by seeing to it that the citizens of a disadvantaged region do not have to bear a relatively greater tax burden in order to obtain a level of public services equivalent to that existing in the country as a whole. In Canada this goal is partially attained through equalization of provincial revenues. The present equalization formula enables the Provincial Governments to offer their citizens a fairly uniform programme of essential services without having to saddle

them with an excessive tax load. The formula takes into account all revenues belonging to the Provincial Governments themselves, exclusive of conditional and unconditional grants, as well as funds obtained through borrowing. It distinguishes 16 sources of provincial revenue and determines the most appropriate tax base for each. For instance, in the case of the liquor tax, the tax base consists of the volume of alcoholic beverages consumed in each province. The most appropriate tax base for personal income tax, corporate tax, succession duties, sales tax and the like is determined in the same way. For each of the 16 sources of revenue, it is then necessary to compare (1) the per capita yield from the tax base of a province at the average rate in force in the provinces as a whole with (2) the per capita yield from the tax bases of the provinces as a whole at the average rate in force in the provinces as a whole. When the total revenues of a province, calculated according to (1) are lower than the national average as calculated in (2), the Federal Government makes up the difference through an equalization payment.

The existing equalization formula does not take into account provincial differences in the needs for public services and the costs of providing these services. It is based on the assumption that all provinces in Canada have similar needs and costs per capita in this sphere.

It is significant also that this formula raises the overall potential tax yield in disadvantaged provinces to the national average but does not lower the total yield of the richer provinces to that level. The formula therefore does not result in equalization of the total potential revenues of all the provinces, but only of those provinces where potential revenues are lower than the national average.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the formula does not take into account the financing aspect of the equalization programme. In fact, all provinces participate in financing the equalization programme, since Canadians of all regions pay taxes to the Federal Government and part of these taxes is used to make equalization payments to all provinces which are entitled to them. Thus the amounts paid into the equalization programme each year overestimate the net transfers made between richer and poorer provinces.

We have stressed above specific aspects of the present equalization formula. Although a definite improvement over previous ones, it would be more likely to produce equality of opportunity in the area of provincial public services if further changes were made in it.

At the present time, the revenues of municipal governments are not subject to equalization, so that municipalities where the average individual income is lower must shoulder a relatively heavier financial burden in order to give their citizens comparable public services. Since part of municipal revenues is used to finance public services having a direct bearing on individuals and their development, such as education, we submit that this situation makes it difficult to bring about a true equality of opportunity for all Canadians.

Our goal should be to give all Canadians access to adequate Federal, provincial and municipal services. The type of redistribution of wealth necessary is based on much more objective criteria, and the following principle should be incorporated into the preamble of the Constitution: Canadians, regardless of where they live, that is,

regardless of the city or province in which they live, should not have to bear a disproportionate financial burden in order to receive an equivalent level of public services.

Behind the concept of equality of opportunity there is the desire to equalize the economic potential of each region. Perhaps this is the most subjective aspect of equality of opportunity. Consideration of the nature of economic potential in various regions raises questions about the means available to achieve such equality of potential and also about its advisability.

Naturally, the basis of equal opportunity remains the existence of a feeling of community of interests in Canada. Insofar as regional economic potential is concerned, however, some economists claim that better balance in the economic development of the various regions can be obtained only at the expense of a reduced rate of growth in the gross national product. Other economists believe that, on the contrary, such a balance can lead to a higher national growth rate. Without attempting to decide the issue, we would suggest that the very existence of regional disparities implies increasingly significant social costs, even apart from such more tangible costs as equalization payments.

If one agrees to define the economic potential of each region in terms of per capita income, one may conclude that the means of reducing differences in potential are (1) a reduction in the relative population of the region or (2) an increase in economic potential through higher invest-

ment in depressed regions. In this connection we might note that in the post-war period, there was indeed a slight narrowing of the gap between the levels of average incomes in the various regions. However, we must at once add that this was due in part to a decrease of the relative population in areas of low average income.

Underlying regional development policies is the recognition that in addition to the advantages of greater manpower mobility, there is a social cost associated with an individual's being compelled to leave his area in order to find a job. Nor can this situation be reconciled with equal opportunity. These considerations lead us logically to consider the relative aspect of regional economic potential.

There is often a tendency to measure regional disparities in strictly monetary terms. Yet pollution levels, crime rates and opportunities for political participation and personal development in general are undoubtedly important factors when comparing one region with another. The monetary aspects of equal opportunity must certainly be weighed against these social factors.

We fully endorse the objective set out in the Victoria Charter, namely "the promotion of economic development to reduce disparities in the social and economic opportunities for all individuals in Canada wherever they may live." As in the case of the redistribution of income among individuals, and for the same reasons, we recommend the insertion of that objective in the preamble of the Constitution.

PART III—FEDERAL INSTITUTIONS

Chapter 12—The Head of State

RECOMMENDATIONS

33. Because of the state of divided opinion in Canada, the Committee does not recommend any change in the monarchical system at the present time.
34. The Committee itself prefers a Canadian as Head of State, and supports the evolutionary process by which the Governor General has been granted more functions as the Head of State for Canada. Eventually, the question of retaining or abolishing the Monarchy will have to be decided by way of clear consultation with the Canadian people.

The central place of the Crown, from the legal point of view, in the public life of Canada is established in Part III (Executive Power) of the British North America Act. Section 9 of the Act provides: "The Executive Government and Authority of and over Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen." Section 15 of the same Act declares that "The Command-in-Chief of the Land and Naval Militia, and of all Naval and Military Forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen."

The B.N.A. Act also provides in section 12 that all powers exercisable under any acts of the United Kingdom Parliament or of the colonial legislatures then (1867) exercised by Governors or Lieutenant Governors were as far as possible to be exercised "by the Governor General, with the Advice or with the Advice and Consent of or in conjunction with the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, or any Member thereof, or by the Governor General individually, as the Case requires." Section 13 adds that "The Provisions of this Act referring to the Governor in Council shall be construed as referring to the Governor General acting by and with the Advice of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada."

While the explicit words of the B.N.A. Act seem to imply that the role of the Canadian Government is that of tendering advice only, yet Canadians are well aware of the constitutional convention that the Governor General, as the representative of the Queen in Canada, must normally follow the advice of his Canadian ministers, and that a corresponding convention applies to the actions of Lieutenant Governors in relation to provincial governments. The binding nature of this advice is one of the principles at the core of our system of responsible government.

We were impressed that Canadians, speaking generally, do not want any major change in direction away from the

parliamentary system of government as an institution. Some witnesses even expressed the fear that, if any change were made in the "head of state system" which we now have, this change would itself imperil parliamentary government. However, a number of Commonwealth countries have become republics without undermining their parliamentary systems. Consequently, there seems to be no basis for the fear that the substance of our democratic institutions, and the basis of our responsible government, would be affected by any change in the relationship of the head of state to the executive and parliamentary institutions in the country.

We believe it is fair to say that any change in the nature of the office of head of state for the Canadian nation is, or could be, institutionally speaking, a change of style and not a change of substance. As one expert witness said:

We will have to settle for the fact that we have a head of state here in Ottawa.

I do not see any insuperable difficulty to having this kind of head of state, because for practical purposes from day to day, that is what we have had for a very long time. (3.24:38)

We thus distinguish style and substance, even while fully recognizing that any formal alteration of the position of the Crown would be a highly emotional issue. Many Canadians made it clear to us that they would either affirm or decry such a change with fervour. But we would infer from the general level of satisfaction of Canadians with their institutions, from a democratic point of view at least, that they are confident that their other fundamental institutions would survive any debate on the issue of change for the Monarchy. In this sense most Canadians seem to feel that any change would be more one of climate, however stormy the passage, than one of fundamental constitution import.

The quantity of the evidence on the head of state shows that it was a recurring theme in the Committee's travels across Canada. There were, first of all, many Canadians who stood squarely for no change in the present system under which the Monarch is represented in Canada by a Governor General who exercises constitutionally limited, but important, functions in the Canadian political system. The main argument advanced by these witnesses was that the Monarch, as the non-partisan head of the Canadian government, protects the people, both institutionally and symbolically, from the excesses of popularly elected governments. For some, the image of the Monarch and the

Royal Family gives them a central position in the maintenance of socially desirable attitudes and manners. For them the fabric of society is stabilized by the presence of a personage of such dignity and respect. Others argued that the Monarchy must be maintained as the historical link with the United Kingdom in the evolutionary growth of Canada.

The following extracts from our evidence indicate the major arguments of those favouring the present system:

Were there no other reason for his office, this residual discretion which the governor general exercises is sufficient justification. The Crown in Canada is not just an historic survival from the past but a living and enduring part of the life of the people. More personal and therefore more firmly based than ever before, affection has been added to reverence. Like very few other things, the monarchy lays claim equally to the affection of French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians, something for us to remember in these days of discordant dialogue between the two founding races. The Canadian monarchy provides a focal point of national acceptance not only for these Canadians but for the many new Canadians of differing backgrounds. Many coming to Canada from Europe know and understand the concept of monarchy from experience in their native lands. New Canadians are somewhat surprised at the apparent apathy of some native Canadians towards the institution of the monarchy. Every nation must have a head of state. An alternative to our form of democratic government is a republic. In an hereditary monarchy one king succeeds another, as an historic proclamation "The King is dead; long live the King" resounds throughout the land. In every election of a president in a republic there is division and strife. (3.62:23)

Another witness said:

The Crown has not been maintained in Canada just because of tradition, and I would remind you that both English-speaking Canadians and French-speaking Canadians have a long history of monarchical forms coming from both Britain and France...

That is not the reason why we have retained the Crown. We have retained it because of its practical political operations and because it has worked...

A man going from a private citizen to a minister of the Crown or from ministry to head of state, can lose all sense of proportion and all his personal balance, and the history of the world and the governing of man has illustrated this hundreds of times. Men, whether they come from monarchical levels or whether they are ordinary Corsican corporals become leaders of the world in the name of democracy and take on an emperorship and they, too, are subject to the bends.

So what should we do in our Constitution? We recognize this danger at the headship of state and the headship of government and separate those two elements. We put one person at the top and call him or her the Monarch and say, "You have all the power, you have all the colour, you represent the legal system, you represent the background of the Constitution or you have all the power, but you can exercise none of it." Then we put another little man up at the

top and say, "You will be the trustee of the powers. We will advise on the use of the powers, but you may never have those powers." Why do we do this? For the simple reason... that politicians no matter where they come from, or who they are must be electable, responsible, criticizable and removable. (3.33:49)

On the other hand, those Canadians who opposed the Monarchy seemed in most cases, to oppose it because of the link which the "Canadian Monarchy" has with the British Crown. Their objections were not so much against the monarchical system, as a system, but against the connection with the United Kingdom. The essence of their position was that the present Monarchy is not a Canadian institution because of these links. As one witness said:

To an English-born Canadian such as myself... the most damning thing I want to say about the English monarchy is that it is not Canadian. (3.20:43)

Another said:

I think the Queen is a very nice lady. I think that she really appreciated visiting Manitoba. I do not think she really paid too much attention to all the visits and to the comments made simply because of the fact that she really... has other problems and does not have that much of a stake. I think at this time in order to really solidify the Canadian unity we should have more contact with our Canadian politicians, our Canadian institutions, with the Canadian people. (3.20:52)

A further observation was:

One thing that I would like to ask—and I do not ask this belligerently or anything—would the people who want to preserve the monarchy be in favour of having a Canadian as a king. If it is the monarchy we want, why not a Canadian? Is there anything magic about having a monarch from some other country? I mean do they have the divine right or anything? Why not a Canadian? (3.33:57)

This group also argued that the Monarchy in Canada was a source of disunity. Ironically, those who argued in favour of continuing the Monarch, argued that it was on the contrary a source of unity. Since the Monarchy cannot be both in the context of the total Canadian society, it would seem that the difficulty of defining the criteria of "unity" or "disunity" prevents any objective evaluation of these respective arguments. One witness even had a remedy, although he was not sure of the diagnosis:

If the Crown cannot be a symbol of unity between French Canada and English Canada, I say, do away with it. But let us do it quickly, and let us part as friends. I am sure Her Majesty would not want to cause division among her Canadian people. (3.39:42)

Those who opposed the institution of the Monarchy also argued that because of its links the Monarchy as established in Canada is a reminder of "colonial" status. Another witness put his misgivings rather graphically:

You get people saying that one thing the fishermen in Newfoundland, the Prairie farmer and the Eskimo in the Arctic have in common is the Queen's head on the coinage and the oath of allegiance to the Queen when they go to take their seats in Parliament. But

what they do not seem to realize is that these items are also common between us and the inhabitants of the Fiji Islands and Hong Kong. There is no necessary connection and no logical connection. There is, in fact, no connection between the concept of the Crown and the concept of Canada as a united country. . . .

What is the function of the Crown? What is the Crown? The Crown is in substance the King of England. There is no balking that point. We do not have a debate here when the King or Queen dies who will be the next one. There is no doubt who the next one will be. The next one will be the person recognized by the English Government as the King of England. So what is the purpose of the people of this country—and I speak as a foreigner recently naturalized—what is the purpose of requiring the people of this country to swear allegiance . . . to the sovereign of another country, a person who has no connection, so little connection with this country? He or she not only is not a Canadian but very rarely comes here. When he does come here, he makes a few ceremonial non-political, purely social gestures, like we are going to the Commonwealth Games and things of that sort. What is the point of making people swear allegiance to that person? The answer is obvious. If it means anything, what it means is that we are bowing the knee to England. And if people say the Crown is a symbol, and it is a symbol, what is it a symbol of? . . . The monarch is the tribal totem of the Anglo-Saxons and . . . when people elected to Parliament or to a legislature are required to swear allegiance to this king of a foreign country, this is equivalent to the bailiff saying, (in William Tell) "You salute my hat. Otherwise you do not take your seat in Parliament." (3.33:43)

Others pointed out that the requirements of the law in connection with the oath of allegiance in citizenship court, in the public service and in Parliament and the Legislatures, as well as the wording of the B.N.A. Act and the form and process of courts, impose, upon Canadians who reject the Monarchy, an unequal psychological burden of citizenship:

This is not merely a matter of imagination. You hear about it everywhere. I will give you just one example I heard recently. A Dutchman in this province who was recently naturalized, recently took his citizenship, was interviewed by the citizenship judge, and he objected to having to swear this oath of allegiance to the Queen of England. He said, "Look here. I was a Dutchman, I am intending to become a Canadian. I am not intending to become an Englishman. Why should I have to swear allegiance to the King of England?" Now what answer could the judge give to him? There is only one answer the judge could give him. He said, "This is the way it is; you have got to do it." He did not, of course, say that this is the Queen of Canada, because the only person that you can say that to with a straight face—this person who lives over there and hardly ever comes here and is not a Canadian is the Queen of Canada—the only person you could say that to with a straight face would be a constitutional lawyer, not a human being. (3.33:44)

They feel that the Monarch cannot be made Queen of Canada by what they consider to be a legal fiction.

Several witnesses felt that the predominant mood of Canadians on the Monarchy was apathy:

One more point on which I had not intended to touch, but since so many others have talked about the Monarchy, I cannot resist a word. It is, it seems to me, a matter of secondary consideration compared to other and weightier issues of national unity. I am indifferent about it, retain it or abolish it as you will. (3.34:34)

There appeared to be a considerable measure of support for having a "Canadian" Governor General who would be the Head of State in his own right, rather than as representing the Monarch, while at the same time recognizing the Monarch as the head of the Commonwealth. Some felt that this was a natural evolutionary step for Canada to take, and that it would, in effect, "Canadianize" the office of Governor General and be the least divisive and most generally satisfying step that could be taken. It was further argued that this would be most in accord with our history and traditions.

The following excerpts illustrate this view:

The first specific change would be to rewrite the preamble to the Act. Rather than describing our government as similar in principle to the United Kingdom, we propose a federal constitution based on the principles of parliamentary supremacy. Executive authority in Canada would be vested in the Governor-General as head of state and the working executive would be responsible to the Parliament of Canada . . .

Those sections which refer to executive authority would be revamped to vest all executive authority in the Governor-General as head of state. This provision which enhances the present office of Governor-General recognizes by inference that Canadians of recognized stature, such as General Vanier or the present Governor-General, would enhance the office and ensure that the head of state was a Canadian, intimately concerned with the welfare of Canada and not a personage removed from Canada whose sovereign authority is not only questioned but disregarded by a majority of Canadians.

The provisions which provide for a Privy Council to advise the Governor-General would remain unchanged. The flexibility in these provisions has allowed for Canadian conventions, customs and procedures to develop to meet the needs of a dynamic policy. Introducing precise legal definitions would therefore, restrict the healthy traditional political process based on the imprecision of the British North America Act. (3.23:60)

Another witness said:

I do not think it is in our power to abolish the monarchy because it is a British institution and they are the people who could abolish it. All we have to do is to have our own head of state and that is all. (3.32:60)

A further view was:

It is my opinion that a head of state should be a Canadian and reside in Canada. I make this suggestion because I think that selecting a head of state from

one family is contrary to the bill of rights and is discriminatory on the grounds of race, creed and colour.

It should be possible in any sovereign, independent state for any citizen regardless of his ethnic origin, religious beliefs or colour to become the head of state as it is in most independent, sovereign states. (3.32:58)

The majority of the members of the Committee would prefer a Canadian as Head of State who would no longer represent a Monarch beyond the seas but would assume office for an established period of years following an affirmative vote of Parliament. We therefore support the evolutionary process by which the Governor General has

been granted more functions as the Head of State for Canada.

However, in the present climate of Canadian opinion any sharp change would probably be an unduly divisive step. As far as we are able to measure, Canadians are about equally divided between those who favour and those who oppose the Monarchy, with the proponents generally being older, and the opponents generally younger.

In such circumstances, therefore, the Committee does not recommend any change in the Monarchy at the present time, but eventually the question of retaining or abolishing it will have to be decided by way of a clear consultation with the Canadian people.

Chapter 13—The Senate

RECOMMENDATIONS

35. The present full veto power of the Senate over legislation should be reduced to a suspensive veto for six months according to the following formula: a bill may become law without the consent of the Senate (1) if the House of Commons, having once passed it, passes it again no less than six months after it was rejected or finally amended by the Senate or, (2) if, within 6 months of third reading of a bill by the House of Commons the Senate has not completed consideration of it, and the House of Commons again passes it at any time after the expiration of the 6 months, but any period when Parliament is prorogued or dissolved shall not be counted in computing the 6 months.
36. The investigative role of the Senate, which has gained more importance in recent years, should be continued and expanded at the initiative of the Senate itself, and the Government should also make more use of the Senate in this way.
37. The Government should be entitled to introduce in the Senate all bills, including money bills but excluding appropriation bills, before their approval by the House of Commons, provided that, in the case of money bills, they should be introduced by the leader of the Government in the Senate on behalf of the Government.
38. The distribution of Senators should be as follows: Newfoundland 6, Prince Edward Island 4, Nova Scotia 10, New Brunswick 10, Quebec 24, Ontario 24, Manitoba 12, Saskatchewan 12, Alberta 12, British Columbia 12, the Yukon Territory 2, and the Northwest Territories 2: a total of 130.
39. All Senators should continue to be appointed by the Federal Government: as vacancies occur in the present Senate, one-half of the Senators from each Province and Territory should be appointed in the same manner as at present; the other half from each Province and Territory should be appointed by the Federal Government from a panel of nominees submitted by the appropriate Provincial or Territorial Government.
40. The personal requirements for appointment to the Senate should be limited to those required for eligibility as an elector in the Canada Elections Act, plus residence in the Province for which a Senator is

appointed. The Quebec structure of electoral divisions should be abolished.

41. The compulsory retirement age for all new Senators should be seventy years. Upon retirement, Senators should retain the right to the title and precedence of Senators and the right to participate in the work of the Senate or of its Committees but not the right to vote or to receive the indemnity of Senators.

The Confederation Debates of 1865 prove that there would have been no Confederation in 1867, or at least no Canada as we know it today, if provision had not been made for the Senate. The Maritimes and Quebec were not prepared to join the union if there was to be only one elected House, based on population. Canada would be a federation, and not a unitary state. Consequently, if the Lower House were based on representation by population, there must be an Upper House giving equality to the regions.

The Honourable George Brown, speaking in the 1865 debates in the House of Assembly on a motion to approve the resolution passed at the 1864 Quebec Conference stated:

The very essence of our compact is that the union shall be federal and not legislative. Our Lower Canada friends have agreed to give us representation by population in the Lower House, on the express condition that they shall have equality in the Upper House. On no other condition could we have advanced a step . . . (p. 88).

Obviously the Fathers of Confederation were determined to establish a Senate, but they did not intend it to be a rival of the House of Commons. The position of the House of Commons was guaranteed by three decisions: only the House of Commons would be elected; all bills for the raising and spending of money would originate in the Commons; the government would be responsible only to the Lower House. It is also clear that the original intention was broadly to pattern the Canadian Senate on the British Upper House and not on the American Senate. As Macdonald said in the 1865 debates:

The Legislative Council will stand in the same relation to the Lower House, as the House of Lords to the House of Commons in England . . . (p.34).

Two roles, then, were intended for the Senate of Canada: 1) the protection of Provincial, minority or

regional rights; 2) the review of legislation (in the words of Sir John A. Macdonald, "the sober second thought in legislation.")

Criticism of the Canadian Senate has centred on the method of selection, the term of appointment, and the failure of some Senators to devote sufficient time and attention to their duties as Senators. The Senate suffers as well from a misunderstanding of its role, unfavourable comparison with the American Senate (which it was never intended to duplicate), and inadequate publicity for the work it has done.

The Senate in fact has done a great deal of good work, as will be discussed later in this chapter. Much of it, unfortunately, has gone unnoticed. If Canadian governments in the past have paid only lip service to Senate reform, the Senate itself in recent times has made great efforts to improve itself.

While there is a body of opinion which holds that a non-elected Senate is an anachronism in a modern democracy, the Committee found that the majority of witnesses who appeared before us recommended the reform of the Senate rather than its abolition, and many suggestions for reform were made.

We agree with the witnesses who argued for reform of the Senate, not its abolition. The reasons which prompted the Fathers of Confederation to set up a bicameral legislative process in Canada are still valid today. Federal states in particular have found upper houses valuable. They allow greater regional representation at the level of the central government. The federal legislative process can and does benefit from regional representation.

The importance of this role cannot be denied. The problems of regional disparities, the recurring talk of alienation from some regions, of separatism from others, and the concern about domination by the Central Provinces reinforce traditional and theoretical arguments. The growth and development of Canada has not reduced regionalism in some aspects, but has rather enhanced it as regions grew stronger. Much remains to be done to improve the relations and understanding between regions, and the Senate can be one important tool.

The veto power of the Canadian Senate is unlimited. Even in the case of money bills (while it is true that the Senate cannot initiate them or increase the amount), it can refuse to pass them or can reduce the amounts. There has been no change in this power since 1867. On the other hand, the constitutional power of the British House of Lords, on which our Senate was basically patterned, has been reduced. In the case of the Senate a curbing of its veto power would, paradoxically, strengthen it, and do so without weakening the House of Commons. It would increase the possibilities of confrontation, but avoid the perpetuation of deadlock by ultimately giving the House of Commons its way.

Suggestions have been made that the Senate could have some special power in confirming the appointments of Judges of the Supreme Court, Ambassadors and heads of

cultural agencies. Such a role could lead to political controversy over the appointment, and to an unnecessary public discussion which would probably weaken the appointee rather than strengthen him. We reject this proposed role.

The investigative role of the Senate is not new, but it has assumed much greater importance in the 1960s. There have been, for example, special committees of the Senate on Manpower and Employment, Land Use in Canada, Aging, Mass Media, Poverty, and Science Policy, in addition to studies by Senate standing committees. Other investigations have been done by special joint committees of the Senate and the House of Commons - such as those on Consumer Credit and on Divorce in 1967, and this Special Joint Committee on the Constitution. Much useful information has been produced by these Committees, and major legislation has resulted from their work.

We recommend that the present veto power of the Senate be reduced to a suspensive veto for a period of six months: so that a bill could become law without the consent of the Senate if the House of Commons, having once passed it, passes it again after a period of six months from the date of its rejection or final amendment by the Senate. This would ensure the continuation of a legislative role for the Senate in which regional forces could work, while at the same time ensuring that the House of Commons could not be thwarted indefinitely. Such a suspensive veto would recognize political realities in Canada, and would give to the Senate a more realistic constitutional base, as a non-elected body, from which to express its opposition to the elected government and the House of Commons. If the Senate did not complete its consideration of a bill or resolution within six months from third reading or passage in the House of Commons, it should become law if again passed by the House of Commons at any time during the same Parliament. Periods when Parliament is prorogued or dissolved would not be counted in computing the six-month period.

In order to help speed up the legislative process we also recommend that the Government should be entitled to introduce in the Senate all bills, including money bills, but excluding appropriation bills, before their approval by the House of Commons; provided that, in the case of money bills, they should be introduced by the Leader of the Government in the Senate on behalf of the Government. Where bills are first introduced in the Senate, a government would obviously be assuming a favourable reception there, since this procedure would make the overriding of the Senate by the House more complicated if it became necessary.

Under the compromise of 1867 the then-existing three regions were given equal representation in the Senate. The Maritimes as a unit had 24 Senators, and there were 24 each for Quebec and Ontario, for a total of 72. As the Western Provinces entered Confederation they were given varying numbers of Senators. In 1915, Western Canada was made a fourth senatorial area with 24 Senators equally distributed between the four provinces, raising the total representation in the Senate to 96. This was further increased to 102, the present maximum, with the allocation of six Senate seats to Newfoundland on its joining Confederation. The present provincial membership is therefore as follows:

Newfoundland	6
Nova Scotia	10
New Brunswick	10
Prince Edward Island	4
Quebec	24
Ontario	24
Manitoba	6
Saskatchewan	6
Alberta	6
British Columbia	6
TOTAL	102

For the purposes of senatorial areas the West in 1915 was considered one unit. While the four Western Provinces share many common concerns, even in 1915 it could not be said that the whole of the West was one economic unit. It is even less so today. Furthermore, since 1915 the economic power of the West has dramatically increased.

Two regions, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories remain without representation in the Senate. There is precedent for having Senatorial representation for the Territories. In 1888, the Northwest Territories were first given two Senators under the authority of a Constitutional amendment of 1886. This was increased to four in 1904 prior to the acquisition of provincial status by Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Many federal states have equal representation in the Upper House for all states. In view of the great disparity in the size and economic power of the various Canadian provinces, the concentration of Francophones mainly in one province, and the historical structure and commitments of every province, we reject total equality for each province as impracticable.

On the other hand, Canada is the only federation in which some of the smaller provincial units have more representatives in the second chamber than have the middle-sized units. In our opinion the time has come for a redistribution of Senate seats to reflect better the present regions of Canada.

Two of the most obvious deficiencies in the current distribution of seats are: (1) the disparity in representation in geographical and other terms between the Western provinces and the other provinces; (2) the fact that the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, being a major part of the Canadian land mass, are not represented at all in the Senate. Consideration must also be given to the fact that a reduction in the complement of Senators from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island would have the effect, in some cases immediately, of reducing the number of members in the House of Commons from those provinces: for sections 51(1)3 and 51A of the British North America Act provide a floor for House of Commons representation for a province by ensuring that no province can have fewer members than Senators. Taking into account these factors as well as historical ones, we propose the following distribution of seats in the Senate, which would increase representation for the West and the North:

Newfoundland	6
Nova Scotia	10
New Brunswick	10

Prince Edward Island	4
Quebec	24
Ontario	24
Manitoba	12
Saskatchewan	12
Alberta	12
British Columbia	12
PROVINCIAL TOTAL	126
Yukon Territory	2
Northwest Territories	2
GRAND TOTAL	130

Considering that in the final analysis the success or failure of the Senate depends more on the quality of its membership than on any other factor, the question of selection is paramount.

The method of selection of Senators has been open to much criticism. Many Canadians think of Senate appointments (made, in fact if not in form, by the Prime Minister) as simply a method of rewarding party faithful. With all due respect to the many fine appointments which have been made, there have been over the years too many appointments which in the eyes of the public confirm this view.

The system of appointment is therefore suspect. Credit is due to the present Prime Minister for a very real attempt to broaden the base. There is no guarantee, however, that future Prime Ministers would follow the same course. This is not to say that political appointments are wrong per se—after all, the Senate is part of the political structure; it is a political arena. The criticism is not that politicians are appointed, but rather the *reason* for their appointment.

If the Senate is to fulfill properly its role, the criterion for membership must not be reward for past service, but rather the *expectation of future service to the nation, based on a recognition of ability and past service in various fields of endeavour*, including the political sphere. Certainly the Canadian system is unique, as no other federation has chosen to follow the Canadian example of placing the appointments of senators in the hands of the central government.

The Committee has spent considerable time in considering the best method of selecting Senators. We do not feel that a wholly or partially elected Senate is the answer in the Canadian context. The decision made in 1867 was not accidental. The appointment system still offers the most scope for a greater diversity of Senators, drawn from all areas of Canadian life. Consequently, we recommend that one half of the Senators from each Province or Territory be appointed by the Federal Government as now, and that the other half be appointed by the Federal Government from nominees proposed by the appropriate Provincial Government or Territorial Council. Thus, although the whole of the formal power of appointment would remain with the Federal Government, half of the Senate members would be, in effect, Provincial appointees. The new system should be brought into effect as vacancies arise, with the first nomination from each Province or Territory to be made from the Provincial or Territorial list, and subsequent nominations alternating.

At present, a person eligible for appointment to the Senate must:

- be of the full age of thirty years;
- be either a natural born or a naturalized Subject of the Queen;
- own real property within the Province he represents to a net value of \$4,000;
- be worth at least \$4,000 over and above his debts and liabilities;
- be a resident in the Province for which he is appointed, and in the case of Quebec, have his residence or real property qualification in the electoral division for which he is appointed, or be a resident therein.

In 1867 this property qualification was very large. In that day it was considered proper to restrict Senate appointments to people of means. Today we find such restrictions repugnant. The Senate must be representative of all facets of society.

The Quebec restriction requiring residence or property holdings in the electoral division of the Senator is ana-

chronistic and ought to be abolished as well as the divisions themselves.

The age limitation imposed in 1867, like the property qualification, reflects the thinking of another era.

Consequently, we recommend that the personal qualifications for appointment to the Senate should be limited to those required for eligibility as an elector under the Canada Elections Act, subject to the additional qualification of residence in the Province or Territory for which a Senator is appointed.

We also recommend that the retirement age for Senators be lowered from the present age of 75 to 70 for all Senators appointed under these new provisions. Members of the present Senate should be able to retire after 70 and before 75 with full salary until they reach the age of 75.

We further recommend that upon retirement Senators should retain the right to the title and precedence of Senators, and the right to participate in the work of the Senate and of its Committees, but not the right to vote or to receive the indemnity of Senators.

Chapter 14—The House of Commons

RECOMMENDATIONS

42. The mechanism of redistribution of seats in the House of Commons as well as the limitations implied in the 15% rule and the Senate rule should be retained in the Constitution. The formula of representation, however, subject to our recommendations on the Bill of Rights, should be the exclusive prerogative of the House of Commons, to be dealt with by ordinary legislation.
43. Every House of Commons should continue for four years, from the day of the return of the writs for choosing the House and no longer, provided that, and notwithstanding any Royal Prerogative, the Governor General should have the power to dissolve Parliament during that period:
 - (1) when the Government is defeated
 - (a) on a motion expressing no confidence in the Government; or
 - (b) on a vote on a specific bill or portion of a bill which the Government has previously declared should be construed as a motion of want of confidence; or
 - (2) when the House of Commons passes a resolution requesting dissolution of Parliament.

In an age in which all of our institutions are being subjected to close reconsideration it would be surprising indeed if the principal institution of our democratic government, the House of Commons, was not also undergoing intense reexamination. We believe this is also true of Provincial Legislatures, but their constitution and functioning does not fall under our terms of reference. However, the provinces could do worse than try to follow the principles and procedures in force at the Federal level.

Many of the day-to-day shortcomings in the functioning of the House of Commons have been obvious to the Members, and in the present Parliament many changes have been made in the rules and practices of the House. Some of these changes have been a matter of dispute among the political parties, but no one has denied the need for serious change. Further changes such as the broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and Committees are even now under consideration.

Outside of Parliament the criticisms are often more radical, and range from the demand of the more extreme

exponents of participatory democracy that representative government should be abolished to the suggestion that elections should be held at fixed intervals, thus lessening the control of the executive over the legislative branch of government.

This Committee has encountered most of these views in the course of its hearings, as well as having experienced some of the unconventional opposition to Parliament through demonstrations staged at several of our meetings. We have, in turn, shown our support for participatory democracy by the wide-ranging character of our hearings, by the procedures we developed for our public meetings, by our extension of simultaneous interpretation to audiences, and by our attempts to obtain permission for the broadcasting of our public meetings.

Most of the issues involved in a discussion of representative democracy today go beyond the confines of our terms of reference, since they involve an analysis of the role and financing of political parties and of the diffusion of information in our society. We do want to affirm our support for the preservation of representative institutions. The alternatives would seem to us to be direct democracy on a universal and instantaneous scale through the use of sophisticated computers, or some form of mob rule whereby the group which can most effectively—or most forcibly—influence the Government would make the principal decisions. The latter method is obviously inappropriate for a democracy, for it would reflect the views of a particular group rather than of the people as a whole. We believe that the former method is also undemocratic, though more subtly so. For we believe that democracy is more than merely the mathematical counting of a majority of votes on every decision, but requires an opportunity for the voter to inform himself and to be persuaded by his fellow citizens.

But our endorsement of representative democracy is not intended as an acceptance of the status quo. Unless major changes are made in our political institutions in the broadest sense, we foresee considerable difficulty in the continuance of the system. While we do not believe that many of the issues can be solved by constitutional provisions, we would support two constitutional changes. In order to maintain a better balance between executive and legislative power, we would recommend the following constitutional provision with respect to the dissolution of Parliament: every House of Commons shall continue for four years from the day of the return of the writs for choosing the House and no longer: provided that, and

notwithstanding any Royal Prerogative, the Governor General may dissolve Parliament during that period of four years (1) when the Government is defeated (a) on a motion expressing no confidence in the Government, or (b) on a vote on a specific bill or portion of a bill which the Government has previously declared should be construed as a motion of want of confidence; or (2) when the House of Commons passes a resolution requesting dissolution of Parliament.

We also believe that the formula for representation in the House of Commons should be cleared up. Section 51 of the British North America Act, which has been amended from time to time to provide for equitable representation, essentially establishes a mathematical formula for representation on the basis of population, with two qualifications: (1) in any readjustment the number of members for any province may not be reduced by the mathematical formula by more than 15% below the representation to which it was previously entitled; and (2) no province may have fewer members of parliament than it has Senators. The 15% clause operates so as to add additional members where this would be required to maintain the representation of some provinces, whereas the Senate clause necessitates rather the reduction of membership from some provinces in order to maintain the required level in others. Evidence presented to us indicated that, on the basis of the present population, other Provinces will have to contribute six members to maintain the number of members in the Maritime Provinces at the same level as Senate representation. This appears to us to be unfair, and we suggest that this number of members should be added to the House, making a total of 269. In keeping with our earlier proposal that there should be a provision in the Bill of Rights for fair representation on the basis of population and in order to minimize the opportunities for any government to tamper with the process of achieving this aim, we would propose that some of the essential prescriptions of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (1964-1965) (R.S.C. 1970 E-2) be inserted in the Constitution, namely:

A. Following each decennial Census a Federal Commission shall be established for each Province, to consider and report upon the readjustment of the representation of each Province in the House of Commons. (section 3).

B. Each Commission for a Province shall consist of four members, namely:

(1) A Chairman to be appointed by the Chief Justice of the Province from one of the courts of his province. (section 6(1)).

(2) Two members, neither of whom can be a member of the Senate or House of Commons or a Legislative Assembly of a province, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons from among residents in that Province as he deems suitable. (sections 6 and 8).

(3) The Representation Commissioner. (section 5).

C. Each Commission shall complete its report within one year and the report laid before the House of Commons. After objections filed with the Speaker and considered by the House have been reconsidered by the Commissions concerned, representation orders shall be issued. They shall be in force until the next following readjustment of boundaries.

Other points now covered by this Act should be determined by ordinary legislation.

We would further propose that the representation formula for the House of Commons should be left in the hands of the House of Commons to deal with by ordinary legislation, retaining in the Constitution only the 15% rule and the Senate rule as limitations on the power of the House to act, but without specifying in the Constitution the mathematical effect of their application.

Other matters respecting the House of Commons we would leave for non-constitutional settlement.

Chapter 15—The Supreme Court of Canada

RECOMMENDATIONS

44. The existence, independence and structure of the Supreme Court of Canada should be provided for in the Constitution.
45. Consultation with the Provinces on appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada must take place. We generally support the methods of consultation proposed in the Victoria Charter, but the Provinces should also be allowed to make nominations to the nominating councils which would be set up under the Victoria proposals if the Attorney-General of Canada and the Attorney General of a province fail to agree on an appointee.
46. The Provinces should be given the right to withdraw appeals in matters of strictly provincial law from the Supreme Court of Canada and to vest final decision on such matters in their own highest courts, thus leaving to the Supreme Court of Canada jurisdiction over matters of Federal law and of constitutional law, including the Bill of Rights. The issue of whether a matter was one of strictly provincial law would be subject to determination by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Presumably no justification, either theoretical or practical, is necessary for a final court of appeal for Canada. The Supreme Court of Canada has now been in existence for almost a century, though it has been the ultimate appellate body for just under one-quarter of that period. For the whole time it has been a statutory rather than a constitutional court, having been established under the Federal Parliament's power under section 101 of the B.N.A. Act to "provide for the Constitution, Maintenance and Organization of a General Court of Appeal for Canada". In a new Constitution, with the added duty of interpreting and enforcing a constitutional Bill of Rights, it would be preferable that the Court itself be provided for in the constitution. Hence Articles 22 to 42 of the Victoria Charter.

We agree with constitutional entrenchment of the Court and we see no reason to depart from its present structure—nine judges sitting during good behaviour up to the age of 75, with three of the judges specified to be members of the Bar of the Province of Quebec because the civil-law system in that Province differs from the common-law system of all the other Provinces.

There are, however, several problem areas, the most difficult of which is the appointment process. Articles 26 to 33 of the Charter are devoted to this question. These articles provide that, in the absence of agreement between the Attorney General of Canada and the Attorney General of a proposed candidate's province for a 90-day period, the Attorney General of Canada has the right to convene a nominating committee. The Attorney General of the Province has the right to opt for a council consisting of all the Attorneys General in Canada or for one composed of the two Attorneys General (Federal and Provincial) and a chairman. If they cannot agree on a chairman, the Chief Justice of the Province shall name the chairman.

Names may be submitted to either kind of nominating council only by the Attorney General of Canada and from among those he has already submitted to the Provincial Attorney General for approval. The council then makes a recommendation to the Governor General in Council, which presumably would accept the recommendation, although it is not bound to do so.

The Charter's appointment process is an imaginative, though somewhat cumbersome, attempt to provide the Provinces with more than merely token consultation when a new judge of the Supreme Court of Canada is to be appointed. We support the principle and have no quarrel with the method, except to suggest that it would be advisable also to allow the Provinces to make nominations to the nominating council.

The effect of the procedures proposed by the Charter would almost certainly be to ensure a nominee acceptable to the Provinces without the necessity of establishing a nominating council. But if a council has in fact to be established, is it necessary to guarantee in advance that a nominee of the Attorney General of Canada is chosen?

Rather than attempting to make more civil-law judges available to hear civil-law appeals by co-opting lower-court judges on an ad hoc basis, as proposed by Article 39 of the Charter, we prefer that every Province should be given the right to withdraw its appeals on matters of strictly provincial law from the Supreme Court of Canada and to vest final decision on such matters in its own highest court. The jurisdiction which would remain in the Supreme Court of Canada would be over questions of Federal law or of the Constitution, and over matters of Provincial law where a province has not withdrawn from the Supreme Court's jurisdiction. Whether or not a matter was one of strictly Provincial law would have to be sub-

ject to decision by the Supreme Court which would be empowered to grant or deny leave to appeal according to its view of each case.

This recommendation for a limitation of Supreme Court jurisdiction is contingent upon our recommendation

above for the entrenchment of a comprehensive Bill of Rights in the Constitution. In our view, the Supreme Court should retain jurisdiction over questions of civil liberties and human rights.

Chapter 16—The National Capital Area

RECOMMENDATIONS

47. There should be a movement by stages towards the possible creation of an autonomous Canadian Capital.
48. The Canadian Capital should be generally the areas of Ontario and of Quebec now defined in the schedule to the National Capital Act (1959).

A country's capital is an essential instrument of national pride. In a federal, bilingual and multicultural country, it must also be an essential instrument of national unity. It must reflect equitably all aspects of that country's character, and each citizen should have a true sense of ownership in the capital of his country regardless of the distance which separates him from the seat of government.

In Canada this has not been and is not now the case. Ottawa was chosen as capital at a time when the Western Provinces did not exist and Canada had only two of its Atlantic Provinces. It was not granted territorial autonomy, but was situated on the territory of one central Province in close proximity to the other.

As Canada grew, so did its Capital, but it did so reflecting the character and the flavour of the Province of which it was a part and on which it was dependent, to the exclusion of the many other characteristics which were already present in, or which were steadily being added to, the fabric of Canada. The absence of a truly bilingual character is particularly marked.

The Federal Government probably first manifested its interest in the capital as a national institution in 1899 with the creation of the Ottawa Improvement Commission but it was not until the late 1920s that a Federal District Commission was set up. Its jurisdiction was limited to the esthetics of Federally owned lands and buildings. It naturally had a low priority on funds during the '30s and '40s. It was restructured in the late '50s into the National Capital Commission when the Federal Parliament, recognized that the Capital area had expanded in fact beyond the limits of the city and of the Province and therefore adopted the National Capital Act. This Act defined the territory over which the N.C.C. would exert influence.

The National Capital Region is an area of 1,800 square miles of Ontario and Québec. The Region is home to some 600,000 inhabitants whose cultural backgrounds are proportionate to those of Canadian citizens in general. Centered about the cities of Hull

and Ottawa, it includes all or part of 57 local municipal jurisdictions. Its problems are typical of those of most urban communities throughout the country. Moreover, the Region is typically Canadian in its content of farmland, bushland, rocky tree-covered hills and innumerable lakes and streams. (*N.C.C. Annual Report, 1970-71, p. 2*)

The current mandate of the N.C.C. empowers it to acquire and dispose of lands, to undertake joint projects with municipalities, to make grants for various purposes and to conduct research for the planning of the National Capital Region. In our view the Capital Area should continue to be the areas of Ontario and Quebec now defined in the schedule to the National Capital Act (1959).

The Committee is of the opinion that the time has come for the Federal Government to have more voice in the management of the Capital of the country. The Committee also believes that the Capital is not just an Ontario city or an Ontario-Quebec city, but a Federal Capital which aspires to be representative of the people of all 10 provinces, and which can indeed be to all the people an instrument of pride and of unity.

It has been suggested that the national capital should be autonomous. The Committee feels that the present maze of jurisdictional difficulties surrounding this issue have created strong barriers to the establishment of an autonomous capital region. Rather, it would be more expedient to view such an autonomous region as a possible, but not a necessary, final stage of development.

We therefore recommend that a Board comprised of equal numbers of Ministers from the Federal, Ontario and Quebec governments, together with representatives of the Regional Communities concerned, should be established to co-ordinate the activities of governments in the Canadian Capital. This Board should be empowered to promote further municipal rationalization and to impart to the Capital those characteristics which truly reflect the reality of Canada.

Present provincial boundaries and provincial jurisdictions would continue to apply, and residents of the National Capital would continue to elect members of Parliament and members of the Legislature of the Province in which they reside, according to the normal provisions of the respective jurisdictions.

The Committee also suggests, as a second stage, that a single new political structure would be necessary to

replace the myriad of local governments found within the National Capital region in order to administer those affairs normally under municipal jurisdictions. Hence, to determine the nature of this structure, we recommend the eventual establishment of a tripartite Board appointed jointly by the Ontario, Quebec, and Federal governments.

We believe that, having gone through these two stages, the population of the National Capital Area may well

consider it advantageous to advance towards fully autonomous status.

We have purposely avoided the term "federal district" because of the bad connotation it generally has. We are convinced, however, that it is within the ingenuity of Canadians to develop a new formula that would achieve the aim of a truly national Capital.

PART IV—THE GOVERNMENTS

Chapter 17—The Division of Powers

RECOMMENDATIONS

49. The use of exclusive lists of Federal and Provincial powers, but with an extended list of concurrent powers, should be continued.
50. Concurrent powers which predominantly affect the national interest should grant paramountcy to the Federal Parliament and those which predominantly affect Provincial or local interests should grant paramountcy to the Provincial legislatures.
51. The Constitution should permit the delegation of executive and administrative powers (as at present), but not of legislative powers, except where expressly specified in this Report.

Federal states exist because there is a political will to unite for certain purposes and to remain apart for others. Consequently one of the most complex aspects of a federal constitution is the division of powers between the central and local authorities in a manner which will reflect the political will and political reality. Political scientists and constitutional lawyers have attempted to construct ideal prototypes and absolute criteria to answer the questions as to how powers should be divided and as to which level should have predominant authority, but, for the most part, federal states and federal constitutions have resulted from political bargaining and not from ideal models.

The question as to how powers should be divided has often been resolved in different ways depending on the priorities and political strength of the constituent parts. Among the competing criteria which are often advanced are: economic efficiency and prosperity, national or uniform standards, the need for collective action, increased strength and power, the threat of foreign or external domination, greater mobility, cultural survival, individualism, the right to self-determination of national groups and peoples, power to the people, the need for more personal government, and the need for less bureaucracy. These criteria often conflict and will only be accommodated to the extent that political forces allow them. The argument that more authority in the central government will result in a higher standard of living will not convince the minority groups who are willing to give a higher place to their social needs than to economic benefits. Most Canadians seek a constitutional formula which will provide a balance between both tendencies.

The division of powers set out by the Fathers of Confederation in 1867 seemed to give more power to the Federal Parliament than to the Provincial Legislatures, and seemed to favour a system in which Parliament would be the dominant authority. The peace, order and good government clause, the disallowance power, the residuary power, the nature of the powers in section 91 as opposed to section 92; sections 24, 58, 59, 90, 93, 94, 95 and 96 and the general spirit of the entire Constitution all point to this. The situation, however, has been changed to a great extent by Court decisions and, in particular, by the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council which greatly extended Provincial authority by expanding jurisdiction under "property and civil rights" and "municipal institutions." The principle adopted by the Judicial Committee that the Legislatures are not subordinate to the Federal Parliament, but are as sovereign in their jurisdiction as the Federal Parliament in its jurisdiction also enhanced the position of the Provinces.

As a result, after 105 years of judicial interpretation and of legislative and administrative practice, we now have a Constitution where the legislative power is about equally divided between the Provincial Legislatures and the Federal Parliament.

The principal general criticisms we have heard of the present division of powers are the following:

- (1) The Federal Parliament does not have sufficient power to manage and plan the economy.
- (2) The Federal Parliament does not have sufficient power to cope with large multinational corporations, international unions, and the overwhelming influence and power of the United States of America.
- (3) The citizens of Canada are handicapped by the lack of national standards in education.
- (4) The Federal Parliament does not have the power to implement a policy of bilingualism in education and other areas now under Provincial jurisdiction, despite the requirements of national unity.
- (5) The citizens of Canada are handicapped by varying Provincial standards in fields which cross Provincial boundaries—e.g., pollution, securities regulation, labour legislation, traffic regulation, etc.
- (6) The present Federal role in social legislation (particularly in shared-cost programs) interferes with or

prevents the Provinces from varying the programs in accordance with Provincial needs, resources, and priorities. It also leads to a poor allocation of public funds and an excessive bureaucracy.

(7) The Province of Quebec does not feel that it has sufficient powers to guarantee the survival of the French language and culture and to establish the social and economic institutions necessary to attain this goal.

(8) The present division of powers is too rigid to allow for varying Provincial and Federal needs. The constitution requires greater flexibility.

(9) The present division of powers is unclear and imprecise, giving rise to much litigation and judicial interpretation. It is also incomplete and does not provide for jurisdiction over modern technology and its resulting problems. The division of powers must be more functional.

(10) The grammatical construction of the jurisdictional categories is poor and there is no logical consistency in the relationship between the categories. Some of the categories are based on things; others are based on persons, location, behaviour, or activities. Again, this leads to imprecision and litigation.

During the hearings of the Committee there were many briefs and much discussion relating to the deficiencies of the present division of powers and many proposed solutions. We shall summarize here the main alternatives which were presented.

The provision of exclusive powers for the Federal Parliament and the Provinces, with a greater number of concurrent powers and a residual clause favouring the Federal or Provincial authorities, would be similar to the present structure, with the difference that there would be a greater use of concurrent powers. The provisions relating to concurrent powers could stipulate which level was paramount. They could also stipulate whether the inferior level could legislate without the consent of the paramount level up to the point of conflict, in which case the legislation of the paramount level would prevail; or, whether the inferior level would require the consent of the paramount level before it could legislate at all. In the United States and Australia, the states can legislate in certain fields without the consent of the central government until the central government decides to legislate, or until it legislates in conflict with the legislation of the states. In the United States, there are additional fields where the states can legislate only with the consent of the federal government.

An extended use of concurrent powers would provide for greater flexibility. It would allow the Provinces to act in their own right in certain areas which were primarily Federal, or to supplement national measures through special provisions for regional needs. On the other hand, it would give the central government the right to assure a certain minimum standard in areas which were primarily provincial.

Concurrent powers are widely used in federal constitutions. The Canadian constitution is the most limited in this respect, with only three concurrent powers, while India is the most extensive, with a list of forty-seven concurrent

powers. Switzerland has divided powers in addition to concurrent powers.

Another possibility is the provision of exclusive Federal and Provincial powers with *the right of delegation*. Delegation could be permitted one way or both ways: either from the Federal Parliament to the Provinces or from the Provinces to the Federal Parliament; or the right to delegate from each level to the other. It could also be stipulated whether the delegation would take place between the Federal Parliament and a single Provincial Legislature or whether it could take place only when a minimum number of Provincial Legislatures are in agreement. The delegation could apply to all legislative powers, to specified powers, or to executive or administrative powers. This mechanism is in some ways more flexible than concurrent powers and in other ways less flexible. The chief danger is the creation of special status for a minority of provinces or a single province.

The provision for executive delegation is widespread in the newer federal constitutions while legislative delegation is more limited. It is, however, generally provided for, and is allowed in both directions.

Some federal constitutions provide for exclusive powers to one level only, combined with concurrent powers and a residual power to the other level. This is the situation in the United States, Australia, Switzerland and Germany where there are exclusive powers only for the central governments as well as concurrent powers with paramountcy to the federal governments, and all other matters are local. According to some this is a more precise method of dividing powers.

An alternative method is to *divide powers* on a national or local basis without regard to subject matter. In this way a federal government could legislate on all matters in those aspects which affect the interest of the entire country or where the activity was interprovincial or international; while the area governments could legislate for all matters which were local or completely within provincial territory. The Fathers of Confederation seemed to have this concept in mind when they drafted the Peace, Order and good Government clause in section 91 and the enabling clauses in section 92.

This method of dividing powers could be used with lists of exclusive and concurrent powers and might thereby serve as a dual residual clause. This would mean that all matters not exclusively listed which were basically national would come under Federal jurisdiction, while those which were basically local or regional would come under Provincial jurisdiction.

Many Committee witnesses have referred to the rigidity of the present division of powers and have urged greater flexibility. We have already referred to the use of concurrent powers and delegation as two means of achieving flexibility. Other important methods are a usable amending formula, special powers which come into operation in emergencies (war, revolution, internal disorder, natural disasters, economic emergencies, etc.), mechanisms or institutions for intergovernmental cooperation (Federal-Provincial conferences, interprovincial coordinating agencies, and independent national commissions for taxation and public spending), and the use of the Federal spending power and shared-cost programs.

Some witnesses suggested that some Provinces (e.g., Quebec) should have greater or more constitutional powers than other Provinces. This would mean that these *special-status Provinces* would be able to legislate for matters on which the Federal Parliament would legislate for the people in other Provinces. This would not be in virtue of a delegation of power or through concurrent powers but through sovereign powers which would be special for certain Provinces.

This type of special status is often confused with special constitutional provisions for one or several provinces. We should note that several Provinces now have and have always had special constitutional provisions without having special legislative powers not existing in other Provinces. Quebec is thus constitutionally entitled to use the civil law system in the area of property and civil rights, but this is not a special status since the area of private law is under provincial jurisdiction for all Provinces. There are also Federal and Provincial legislative provisions which apply in some Provinces and make them different, but, again, these Provinces do not have a special status in that they have special legislative powers. Consequently, the Constitution has recognized and can continue to recognize that Quebec is not a Province like the others without according it special or additional legislative powers.

Despite the fact that a Province might have special constitutional provisions and special legislative provisions to meet its particular needs without having a special status, some would still argue that special status, or additional legislative power, is desirable. The arguments we heard against this type of special status are:

- (1) That it isolates a particular Province and, in effect, destroys the minimum requirements for a federal state;
- (2) That it places the special-status Province and its representatives in an untenable position in Federal institutions;
- (3) That it creates different classes of citizenship within the same state;

- (4) That it jeopardizes the integrity of the state, internally and externally.

It is possible to conceive of some type of special status of this nature, but it is difficult to envisage how the citizens of the special-status Province could have the same rights within the Federal state, as a whole, as the citizens of the other Provinces.

"Opting out" and "opting in" are different matters. Such arrangements do not require special constitutional powers and indeed do not affect the division of powers. They are in effect a type of delegation, and if provided for in the Constitution, would be permanently available to all Provinces. If they were, as is usually the case, rendered possible by Federal legislation, they would be completely within the sovereign control of the Federal Parliament and could be rescinded at will.

The Committee recommends that there should continue to be exclusive lists of Federal and Provincial powers but with an extended list of concurrent powers.

Concurrent powers which predominantly affect the national interest should grant paramountcy to the Federal authority and those which predominantly affect the Provincial or local interest should grant paramountcy to the Provincial authorities.

The Constitution should permit the delegation of executive and administrative powers (as it does now) but not of legislative powers except in the one instance (the criminal law power) where we recommend it below.

While the descriptions of the legislative categories found in the present division of powers remain valuable, since they have been subject to considerable judicial interpretation, some attempt should be made to eliminate ambiguous heads and provide for logically consistent categories. We do not, however, regard such a drafting project as our responsibility as a Parliamentary Committee. The details of our proposals for substantive change in the present division of powers are set out throughout the Report.

Chapter 18—The General Legislative Power of Parliament

RECOMMENDATIONS

52. The "Peace, Order, and good Government" power should be retained in the Constitution as an expression of the overriding Federal legislative power over matters of a national nature.
53. Since the Federal General Legislative Power is counterbalanced by a Provincial power over matters of a Provincial or local nature, there is no place for a purely residuary power.

The legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada is principally contained in section 91 of the British North America Act. The form of the grant of power has been responsible for a great deal of constitutional litigation and is therefore worth remarking.

First, the Federal legislative power is said to reside in the Queen "by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate and House of Commons"—a style of grant which is unnecessary in the light of section 17, which has already provided that Parliament consists of the Queen, the Senate and the House of Commons. Second, using words hallowed in British colonial tradition, the power bestowed is "to make Laws for the Peace, Order, and good Government of Canada." The power conferred on Parliament by these enacting words is known as the "General Power" of Parliament. The enacting clause goes on to provide that the General Power is "in relation to all Matters not coming within the Classes of Subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces."

The declaratory clause follows, setting out 31 heads of exclusive Parliamentary power "for greater Certainty, but not so as to restrict the Generality of the foregoing Terms of this section." Within the declaratory clause it is stated that the legislative authority of Parliament extends to the enumerated classes of subjects, "notwithstanding anything in this Act." This "notwithstanding" provision is called the *non obstante* provision. After the enumeration of exclusive Federal powers there are the following concluding words, sometimes called the "deeming clause":

And any Matter coming within any of the Classes of Subjects enumerated in this Section shall not be deemed to come within the Class of Matters of a local or private Nature comprised in the Enumeration of the Classes of Subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces.

We are not concerned here with textual analysis as such, but we would draw attention to the judicial interpretation of the Federal General Power. The apparent legislative intent of the deeming clause was to ensure that the enumerated classes of matters in section 91 took precedence over section 92(16) in the Provincial list of powers: "Generally all Matters of a local or private Nature in the Province." Both the grammar and the phrasing of the deeming clause would appear to make this point clear. However, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council gave that clause a wider interpretation, which at the same time had the effect of weakening the General Power. The Privy Council took the view that it was the deeming clause (rather than, as the text would appear clearly to state, the *non obstante* provision in the declaratory clause) which established the superiority of the enumerated heads of section 91 over the enumerated heads of section 92, in the event of conflict. The converse of this proposition was that, since the deeming clause established a priority only for the enumerated powers in section 91, the General Power had no priority. It was, in effect, a residuary power.

For the Privy Council by the 1920s the General Power was an emergency power to be used only in abnormal conditions such as war, famine, or pestilence, or a minor power which could justify the incorporation of companies with non-provincial objects, the expulsion of aliens, or the reference of questions to the courts for advisory opinions: in other words, it could be used only where there was no possibility of conflict with section 92, since in every case of conflict the Provincial power would prevail.

We are not so naïve as to think that this interpretation came about purely as a matter of textual analysis. Clearly, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and notably Lords Watson and Haldane, came to a value judgment that the apparent meaning of the British North America Act would give too much power to the Federal Parliament, and especially that a broad interpretation of the General Power could erode Provincial power entirely. We are not without sympathy for this point of view, but we believe that the solution which the Judicial Committee decided on, viz., reducing the General Power to a merely residual power, was much too extreme.

In our view there is a fundamental need for a grant of power recognizing Federal jurisdiction in matters of national interest and possessed of a genuine national character. This would be a counterpart to the Provincial jurisdiction in section 92(16) over "all Matters of a merely

local or private Nature in the Province." It would give an orientation to the whole of section 91 as subsection 16 may be thought to do to all of section 92.

The Privy Council itself began a rehabilitation of the General Power in the 1930s, and this trend continued after the Supreme Court of Canada became the court of final resort. As a result, matters such as aeronautics, broadcasting, the regulation of the national capital district, and labour relations in the atomic energy field have been assigned to the Federal Government under the General Power. We expect this trend to continue. The General Power is, therefore, no longer a merely residuary power, nor is it likely to become so again.

Some witnesses before us argued that the residuary power should rest with the Provinces rather than with the Federal Government. We could accept such a change provided that it applied only to the residuary aspect of the General Power and did not touch its positive power. For, as we have stated, we are convinced of the necessity of

Federal jurisdiction over matters of a national nature. However, as we envisage the Constitution there should rather be a complete division of legislative power, with matters of a national character in Federal hands and those of a local or provincial nature under Provincial control. In such a division of powers there would be no real residuary power, since all power would initially be divided according to its aspect. In this context the location of residuary powers would be meaningless.

We frankly recognize that the triad of "Peace, Order, and good Government" is conceptually too vague to be entirely satisfactory as an expression of the Federal General Power to legislate in the national interest. However, the literal wording has now been qualified by more than a century of judicial interpretation, and we are reluctant to suggest an alternative, since we regard our task as a conceptual rather than a drafting one. We therefore content ourselves with expressing the view that whatever the language employed, the General Power should indicate the Federal Parliament's guardianship over the national interest.

Chapter 19—Taxing Powers

RECOMMENDATIONS

54. Generally speaking and subject to recommendation 55, we endorse the principle that the Federal and Provincial Governments should have access to all fields of taxation. However, in order to bring about a division of revenues that may accurately reflect the priorities of each government, there should be Federal-Provincial consultations to determine the most equitable means of apportioning joint fields of taxation in the light of:

(a) the projected responsibilities of each level of government in the immediate future;

(b) the anticipated increases in their respective expenditures;

(c) economic and administrative limitations, such as preserving sufficient leverage for the Federal Government, by means of its taxation system, to discharge effectively its function of managing the economy.

55. Provincial Legislatures should have the right to impose indirect taxes provided that they do not impede interprovincial or international trade and do not fall on persons resident in other Provinces. These limitations could be satisfied by tax collection through an interprovincial or Federal Provincial collection agency, or by tax collection agreements.

The sections of the Canadian Constitution that concern the division of tax fields are well known. The Parliament of Canada may pass measures for "The raising of Money by any Mode or System of Taxation" (section 91(3)); and the Legislative Assemblies have the following powers: "Direct Taxation within the Province in order to the raising of a Revenue for Provincial Purposes" (section 92(2)), and "Shop, Saloon, Tavern, Auctioneer, and other Licences in order to the raising of a Revenue for Provincial, Local, or Municipal Purposes" (section 92(9)).

Interpretation of these constitutional texts has been quite broad and has permitted a measure of flexibility in sharing tax fields to allow for changes in the respective responsibilities of the different levels of government. Undoubtedly, such sharing of tax fields to meet the needs of each government is essential in a federal system. In this connection, the evidence given by one expert who appeared before this Committee is significant:

Utilization of tax fields has been a very important matter for the past 35 years, especially since January 1941, when the provinces and federal government of the day met to discuss the Rowell-Sirois Report. Ever since that date, the governments have been meeting every year, or at least every second year, to discuss the sharing of tax revenue and these discussions have become, I believe, increasingly frequent and intensive in the course of the years.

However, the discussions have dealt with the utilization of those tax fields to which both levels of government clearly have access, rather than with the constitutional provisions themselves. In other words, the real problem arising with the provinces concerned not the constitutional provisions, but rather the use which the two levels of government make of the field of direct taxation. (2.6:9)

The most important point in the Federal Government's constitutional proposals in this area is the principle of accessibility for all governments to all tax fields. (*The Taxing Powers and the Constitution of Canada*). Theoretically, this principle would remove all constitutional obstacles in the way of use by the Federal or the Provincial governments of any tax field. In practice, however, the only substantial change from the present situation would be to give Provincial Governments access to the field of indirect sales tax.

Indeed, the rule of accessibility has existed since 1867 for direct taxation. Before 1962, however, a Province had to collect personal and corporate income tax itself in order to enjoy complete independence in these two important fields of direct taxation. In 1962, Federal Government made its collection agreement with the Provincial Governments more flexible by giving them greater liberty to use these tax fields as they saw fit. Currently, the collection agreement between the Federal and Provincial Governments requires the latter only to adjust their tax structure to that of the corresponding Federal taxes.

Generally speaking, we endorse the principle whereby the Federal and Provincial Legislatures have access to all tax fields. When this principle is applied, priorities in Federal or Provincial spending become the most significant factor in determining the division of the various tax fields. However, we feel that the application of this principle requires certain guarantees, since the division of tax fields has to satisfy many other criteria. For instance, it

bears repeating that the various levels of government invariably draw their revenue from the same taxpayers.

Furthermore, there is no certainty that the greater accessibility arising from the changes introduced in 1962 and from the current proposals of the Federal Government will in fact bring about a division that will accurately reflect the priorities of each government. Indeed, it is not clear that the present occupancy of tax fields by the various governments constitutes a fair starting point, in view of the current needs of each level of government.

The other aspect of this problem is the existence of marked differences in the increasing yields from various taxes. At the present time, the yield from Federal tax fields is rising more rapidly than that from Provincial and municipal tax fields. Some assume from this that Federal expenditures should continue to increase more rapidly than Provincial and municipal outlays. We feel that this assumption deserves at least careful study. Recent events do not bear it out, and should it eventually prove to be unjustified it could result in maintaining certain useless or outdated programs at the Federal level.

We believe that these problems can be resolved by Federal-Provincial consultations. But it will be necessary, at the outset, to concentrate upon determining the most equitable means of apportioning joint tax fields in the light of the projected responsibilities of each level of government in the immediate future, anticipated increases in their respective expenditures and, of course, economic and administrative restraints such as preserving sufficient power for the Federal government, by

means of its taxation system, to discharge effectively its counter-cyclical function of regulating the economy.

The greatest limitation on the Provincial Governments in certain tax fields necessarily lies in maintaining the free movement of international and interprovincial trade and in avoiding the dangers of double taxation. We therefore recommend that the Provinces be given access to fields of indirect taxation, provided that the taxes imposed do not impede interprovincial or international trade and do not fall on persons resident in other Provinces. Hence such taxes should be collected by an interprovincial or a Federal-Provincial tax collection agency, or under tax collection agreements. We have in mind, in particular, the fields of indirect sales tax and indirect death duties.

The existence of a tax collection agency would require the coordination of each tax to be collected through this interprovincial or Federal-Provincial agency. Moreover, the agency would prevent double taxation in the taxes it would collect on behalf of the Federal or Provincial governments. It would also make possible greater flexibility in collecting taxes and in distributing the yield from these taxes among Provinces. Thus we can readily envision a sales tax being collected from manufacturers by this agency, and the proceeds of such tax being distributed among the Provinces according to criteria agreed on in advance by the Provincial Governments. Finally, we feel that such a collection agency would provide the Provinces with a tool to ensure better balance in their tax competition with the Federal Government, since it would widen the range of tax fields to which the Provincial Governments have access.

Chapter 20—The Federal Spending Power

RECOMMENDATIONS

56. The power of the Federal Parliament to make conditional grants for general Federal-Provincial (shared-cost) programs should be subject to the establishment of a national consensus both for the institution of any new program and for the continuation of any existing one. A consensus would be established by the affirmative vote of the Legislatures in three of the four regions of Canada according to the following formula: the vote of the Legislatures in the Atlantic region would be considered to be in the affirmative if any two of the Legislatures of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Newfoundland were in favour; the vote of the Legislatures of the Western region would be considered to be in the affirmative with the agreement of any two of the four Legislatures. The consensus for existing joint programs should be tested every 10 years.
57. If a Province does not wish to participate in a program for which there is a national consensus, the Federal Government should pay the Government of that Province a sum equal to the amount it would have cost the Federal Government to implement the program in the Province. However, a tax collection fee of about 1%, equivalent to the cost of collecting the money paid to the Province, should be deducted from the amount paid to such non-participating Provinces.
58. In order that the objectives of joint programs may be more effectively realized, conditional Federal grants should preferably be based on the cost of the programs in each Province. However, since a 50-50 cost-sharing formula, when applied to the expenditures made in each Province, constitutes too great an incentive in high-income Provinces, conditional Federal grants should not be made for that portion of Provincial expenditures which lies above the national average cost of the service. The maximum per capita amount to which a Province would be entitled would thus correspond to the per capita national expenditure, and additional expenditures by a Provincial Government would in no way increase the Federal grant to that Province.

The Canadian Constitution does not contain explicit provisions concerning the spending power; rather, this power stems from the division of legislative jurisdictions between Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures,

more specifically as stipulated in Sections 91 to 95 inclusive.

The judicial interpretation in favour of a Federal spending power has been based primarily on Section 91(1A), which gives the Parliament of Canada authority to legislate in respect of "The Public Debt and Property", and Section 91(3), which allows "The raising of Money by any Mode or System of Taxation". Parliament has therefore been able to allocate monies from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for any purpose whatsoever, provided that the legislation authorizing the expenditure does not constitute an invasion of Provincial jurisdiction. Hence the Federal spending power is the power of the Parliament of Canada to make payments to individuals, institutions and Provincial Governments for purposes concerning which it does not necessarily have the substantive power to legislate.

While some constitutionalists would challenge the breadth of this Federal power, it is a fact that Parliament does make payments to individuals and institutions and provides both conditional and unconditional grants to the Provincial Governments. Such payments now represent more than 30% of Federal expenditures and more than 60% of the revenues of some Provincial Governments.

In this chapter we shall limit our discussion to the question of conditional payments to Provincial Governments. We have already dealt with equalization payments, by far the largest unconditional payments that the Federal Government makes to the Provinces, in Chapter 11. Payments to individuals are discussed below in Chapter 26.

In its constitutional proposals (*Federal-Provincial Grants and the Spending Power of Parliament*) the Federal Government reaffirms its power to make payments to individuals, institutions and Provincial Governments. However, it does suggest certain restrictions on its power to make conditional payments to the Provinces. While these proposals may not meet the basic objections expressed by the Government of the Province of Quebec with regard to the spending power, they are a satisfactory answer to the two principal criticisms voiced by Provincial Governments regarding conditional payments to the Provinces.

The text of the Federal proposals is as follows:

The proposed principles would establish two limitations on the use by Parliament of its power to make conditional grants for general federal-provincial pro-

grammes—first the existence of a “broad national consensus” in favour of any programme, and secondly the assurance that a “fiscal penalty” would not be imposed upon the people of non-participating provinces. The Government of Canada would suggest the following method for giving effect to these two requirements:

(1) The determination as to when the national interest or extra-provincial interests warranted a new shared-cost programme between the Government of Canada and the governments of the provinces would be arrived at jointly by Parliament and the provincial legislatures, in the manner described below, instead of by Parliament alone.

(2) Where a consensus had been reached that a new shared-cost programme was desirable, the provincial governments whose legislatures had voted for the consensus would receive conditional grants for the programme, once it was started by them. In the provinces whose legislatures had voted against the consensus, the people of the province would be paid grants equivalent in the aggregate to the average per capita amount paid to the participating provinces (multiplied by the population of the non-participating province).

The introduction into the Constitution of these two requirements would meet all of the provincial objections to the present procedures for initiating shared-cost programmes. Parliament would no longer have the power to decide unilaterally when a shared-cost programme ought to be initiated: a provincial consensus would be required. The payment of grants to the people of the provinces whose legislatures had voted against the consensus would meet the “taxation without benefit” argument. The two principles taken together would ensure that the priorities of any provincial government would be changed only if its legislature had supported the consensus. They would also mean that Parliament would not be able to give effect to its judgment that the national interest had come to attach to some problem or programme within provincial jurisdiction unless enough legislatures had voted their agreement, and it would be able to do so only in the provinces where the legislatures had voted for Parliament's proposal.

The first step in determining whether there was a consensus in favour of a new shared-cost programme would be the presentation to the Parliament of Canada by the federal government of a resolution proposing the programme. If Parliament approved the resolution, it would be transmitted to the provincial governments for submission to their legislatures. The legislatures, in turn, would approve or reject the resolution. The determination as to whether there was a provincial consensus in favour of the shared-cost programme would be made by reference to the Senate divisions provided for in the Constitution.

For the purposes of this proposal the Senate could be regarded as having four divisions under the present Constitution, namely Ontario, Quebec, the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland, and the Western Provinces. The affirmative vote of the legislatures in at least three of these Senate divisions would be required before Parliament could proceed with the

proposed shared-cost programme. The vote of the legislatures in the Atlantic region would be considered to be in the affirmative if the legislatures of provinces having at least 16 of the 30 Senate seats of that region were to vote for the resolution (two of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Newfoundland). The vote of the legislatures of the Western region would be considered to be in the affirmative if the legislatures of provinces having 12 of the 24 Senate seats of that region were to vote for the resolution (two of the Western Provinces).

An affirmative vote on the part of three Senate divisions would represent a provincial consensus in favour of Parliament's proposal. In the event of a negative vote—two or more Senate divisions voting against a proposal—Parliament could re-transmit its resolution to the governments of the provinces whose legislatures had voted against the proposal, within one year, to determine whether the legislatures wished to change their decision given the results of the votes in other legislatures. Subsequently Parliament could not re-submit its resolution to the provinces more often than once every two or three years. (pp. 38-42)

By proposing that a national consensus be reached before any program is launched, the Federal Government has taken into account the fact that prior consultation has been lacking in setting up such shared-cost programs. We accept the Federal proposal for the establishment of a consensus, but without reference to Senate divisions. To achieve such a consensus, then, the Legislatures in at least three of the four regions of Canada would have to accept the program. In the Western and Atlantic regions a program would require approval by the Legislatures of at least two of the four Provinces other than Prince Edward Island.

In order to respect Provincial priorities in areas of Provincial legislative jurisdiction, the Federal Government proposes that any Province should have the right to opt out of any such joint programs. A non-participating Province would receive compensation in the form of a reimbursement to individual residents of that Province equal to the amount that would have been paid to the Provincial Government if it had participated in the program.

We endorse the Federal Government's proposal that a national consensus should be arrived at before a shared-cost program is launched. However, we recommend that the national consensus rule apply every ten years for each joint program, including existing programs, so as to prevent the pointless perpetuation of certain joint programs, and also to ensure that the Federal Government's objective of not unduly influencing Provincial priorities is achieved permanently by permitting the Provinces to reconsider periodically their decision whether or not to participate.

With regard to the method of compensation provided in the Federal Government's proposals should a Province elect to opt out, direct reimbursement to individuals is unacceptable to us. From the administrative standpoint it implies that all individuals in a non-participating province would first pay a certain amount of tax in one form or another to the Federal Government; they would then receive a cheque or a tax credit from the Federal Government; finally these same individuals would be taxed again

by their Provincial Government, which would likely want to set up a program to replace the one in which it refused to participate. Administratively, this procedure seems too unwieldy.

Furthermore, it appears to us that the impossibility of identifying the tax, and the amount paid by each individual to meet the costs of the program in question, constitutes a major obstacle to the method of compensation proposed by the Federal Government. To overcome this difficulty the Federal Government would probably decide to grant *equal* compensation to individual residents or taxpayers in a non-participating Province. The result would be a more extensive redistribution of income in that Province.

For these reasons we reject the form of compensation advocated by the Federal Government. Instead, we suggest that the Federal Government pay the Provincial Government a sum equal to the amount it would have cost the Federal Government to implement the program in the Province concerned. However, in order to take into account the cost of collection to the Federal Government of the money paid to non-participating Provinces, we recommend that a collection fee of about 1 per cent, equivalent to the collection cost, be deducted from the amount paid to non-participating Provinces. This would provide an incentive for the Provinces to participate while still leaving them free to opt out—if they have valid reasons for doing so—by paying the cost of tax collecting made in their stead.

From the administrative standpoint, this seems a much easier formula and is still consistent with the spirit of a flexible federalism.

We realize that the fact that Quebec has opted out of certain joint programs pursuant to the Established Programs Act (Transitional Agreements), and receives a portion of the compensation in the form of tax points, provides a complication. In order to get around the difficulty while still preserving the spirit of our recommendations, we propose a compromise solution in the arrangements between the Province of Quebec and the Federal Government. Because Quebec collects its own income tax and already occupies a broader share in the personal income tax field as the only Province which has elected to opt out of certain joint programs, we recommend that the Federal Government maintain its special abatement in Quebec, and that the cost of collecting taxes not apply to the abatement portion of the total compensation.

This seems a logical solution since under the Established Programs (Transitional Agreements) Act a Province which decides in favour of non-participation still has to create public services in compliance with the terms of each "established" program in order to be entitled to tax compensation. In the Federal proposals concerning the constitutional right of a Province to opt out of a given program, tax compensation is wholly unconditional; therefore, the Government of the non-participating Province is under no obligation whatsoever to create a similar program.

With regard to the very basis of conditional grants, we raise a number of fundamental objections to certain terms and conditions of existing programs. The aim of such conditional payments is to influence the Provincial Governments so that some of their services will take the national interest into greater account and, especially, to

enable them to achieve standards regarded as a minimum for Canada as a whole.

In this connection, it is interesting to compare the tax incentives applied in respect of each of the three main shared-cost programs—namely, health insurance, hospitalization insurance, and assistance to post-secondary education. The following table illustrates the respective formulas used in calculating the amounts to be paid to each Provincial Government. These amounts are always equivalent to 50 per cent of the total national cost for each of the programs (in the case of assistance to post-secondary education the proportion is slightly higher), but the formulas take into account either average provincial or average national costs, or both:

Program	Factors Determining the Federal Grant	
	Average Provincial Cost	Average National Cost
Health insurance	0%	50%
Hospitalization insurance	25%	25%
Post-secondary education	50%	0%

We feel that certain aspects of these programs conflict with the objectives which motivate Federal intervention in spheres of Provincial jurisdiction. Thus, in the case of health insurance, where the Federal grant is solely determined by the average national cost and by the size of the population of a Province, several Provincial Governments receive an amount considerably in excess of 50 per cent of the total cost of the program in their own Province. Although this suggests that the standards of medical services in these Provinces are relatively low, the formula itself contains no incentive for them to improve the quality of their services. We feel, too, that the objectives of the health insurance program are hard to reconcile with the fact that most of the Provinces with low average revenues have had to delay their participation in this program because of insufficient financial resources.

In the case of the post-secondary education assistance program, the Federal grant is based on the total cost of the program in each Province. Consequently, there is a very strong incentive for all Provinces to increase their post-secondary education expenditures. However, in those Provinces where the standards of services are relatively low, this tax incentive is simply removed and replaced by an unconditional per capita grant. As a result, the post-secondary education assistance program promotes improvement of standards only in those Provinces where standards are already relatively high.

Generally speaking, we believe that Federal conditional grants based on the costs of programs in each Province are more in line with the objectives which motivate Federal intervention in spheres of Provincial jurisdiction. However, we feel that the 50-50 formula constitutes too high a tax incentive in Provinces with high average revenues. If the Federal Government is going to reimburse 50 cents for each dollar spent, it is obvious that the Governments of the richer Provinces, having more funds to earmark for these programs, will receive more money from the Feder-

al Government. On the other hand, the poorer Provinces are being penalized because they cannot spend enough. In order to rectify this situation we submit that conditional grants should never apply to that portion of expenditures which lies above the national average. The maximum per

capita amount to which a Province would be entitled would then correspond to the per capita national expenditure, and additional expenditures by a Provincial Government would in no way increase the Federal grant to that Province.

Chapter 21—Intergovernmental Relations

RECOMMENDATIONS

59. **More communication and fuller cooperation among all levels of government are imperative needs. The achievement of these ends involves the improvement and simplification of the means of liaison and, where necessary, the creation of new mechanisms.**
60. **The Constitution should provide for a Federal-Provincial Conference of First Ministers to be called by the Prime Minister of Canada at least once a year unless in any year a majority of the First Ministers decide to dispense with the Conference.**
61. **The Federal Government should appoint a Minister of State for Intergovernmental Affairs to respond to the political challenges and opportunities resulting from closer intergovernmental relationships.**
62. **A permanent Federal-Provincial secretariat for intergovernmental relations should be established.**
63. **A tri-level conference among Federal, Provincial and Municipal governments should be called at least once a year.**

The relations among governments in Canada, at both the political and official levels, are generally not understood by Canadians. These relationships are very important in the day-to-day operations of governments, and often have effects far beyond the immediate program or policy being explored or developed. Partly because these relationships are not well understood, many who spoke to the Committee yearned for simple, comprehensible structures. Such a desire reveals that Canadians are rightly suspicious that the proliferation of coordinating agencies and administration of one kind or another may be unnecessary.

Undoubtedly there are no simple rules for the myriad of relationships necessary among three levels of government in a country as varied and vast as Canada. We feel, however, that something can be done to make intergovernmental relations more meaningful, more direct, more efficient and more relevant to all Canadians.

Each individual Canadian exists in at least three different political communities, and exclusive jurisdictions of governments are part of the framework of order he or she understands. Nevertheless each individual is affected indivisibly by the whole of government. As one witness said:

For all of the verbal paraphernalia of the Constitution about exclusive jurisdiction, there is hardly an area of power in which there is not a very considerable degree of interdependence... The truth of the matter is that governments supposedly are interdependent because they are dealing... with the same people...

The most sensible way of dealing with it is that they very often have to develop and they do develop methods of co-operating. There is some division of labour, some degree of co-operation and some degree of consultation. And cumbersome and time-consuming though it is, this seems to work pretty well. I would think that we could stand a constitutional revision which would provide for a good deal more concurrent jurisdiction than there is, but recognizing what is in fact the truth of the matter, that there is an interdependence here, that there is a real and crying interest for any provincial government in what federal monetary policy is. It is absurd to say that this is exclusively a federal matter and that the provinces should have nothing to do with it, because it directly affects the way they operate just as what they do in their own jurisdictions vitally affects federal monetary policy. So we may have to spend the next century developing many more of these institutions of a consultative kind, which still leaves room for decisions to be made but on the basis of probably more concurrence of jurisdiction and more consultation and co-operation. (3.24:22)

We agree fully that more cooperation, liaison, and even harmony, is needed among all levels of government. The question is: what mechanisms will help guide us to these objectives? Some witnesses gave us these suggestions:

The nature of the solution we propose puts additional emphasis on a more sophisticated structure of intergovernmental liaison than we have at the present time. There is already a good deal of this in federal-provincial relations but it is basically very unstructured. Formalization is essential if we are to meet our responsibilities... We (propose) a pyramidal form of organization...

First, we would have to acknowledge that in the parliamentary form of government the position of the Prime Minister or Premier is pre-eminent and we therefore would argue that there should be a permanent committee of the first ministers meeting at least

annually. This committee would not be a negotiation committee; it would deal with the definition and development of objectives rather than with detailed programs. We also explain at some length why we would favour the continuation of a plenary federal-provincial conference. Not as an instrument of negotiation but for the examination of principles and matters of broad public interest. We think in many ways this is a very useful way of involving the public through throwing the meetings of the plenary conference open to television, to radio and to public observers as has been done in several of the constitutional conferences in the recent past.

Most of the detailed work in the negotiations and arrangements which we think would be necessary should be carried on by functional committees of ministers. These would replace the numerous special purpose committees which now carry on most of the detailed work in these fields. Prominent among these would be the committee of the Ministers of Finance and the Provincial Treasurers which first was set up in 1959 and which has been operating much more actively in recent years. This in addition to having its responsibilities in the functional fiscal field would act, in our opinion, in the future as it has in the past with the sort of staff relationship to the committee of first ministers which would be the prime committee of this organization we envisage.

We also think it would be essential that there would be committees of officials and technical support of all ministerial committees and prominent among these would be the committee of senior officials which has been set up in support of the constitutional conference—something along these lines although not necessarily identical. However, I think the part that has been played by this committee of senior civil servants in support of the constitutional conference is indicative of the very important part such a continuing formally structured committee of senior officials plays in any matters of this kind. (3.45:21)

We also heard the following view:

Under our present organization there are something like 175 to 200 different federal-provincial committees which meet from time to time or have met from time to time. I think this could be narrowed down very substantially to a number of perhaps a dozen or more strictly functional committees, say a federal-provincial committee on health and a committee on natural resources and so forth and so on, which would deal with these subjects as they come up and which would then pass them on through the hierarchical process up to the federal-provincial first ministers who would then agree upon a policy which would be carried back to their respective legislatures of the Parliament for approval or not, as the case may be.

It would have to be supported by a permanent secretariat. At one time I did not believe this, but I have come to the conclusion that the degree of co-ordination and co-operation between the levels of government will be so great under any effective process of co-operative federalism or consultative federalism, or whatever you wish to call it, that some form of effective, continuing, permanent secretariat is required.

You have this at the present time in the constitution field with the Constitutional Secretariat which, in many respects is an intergovernmental body even though it is largely financed and staffed by the federal government... In fact I think its powers could be extended very substantially into much broader fields to the advantage of everyone concerned. (3.15:13)

Another expert witness said:

I do think, for example, that at the level of the standards by which programs are governed, understandings could be much firmer. There are cases, which I don't need to quote, when Quebec officers... and the same situation probably happens in the other provinces, in the small provinces, without any doubt, and still more so, where their officers might have worked on a program for weeks and months when, suddenly, the Federal Government issues its White Paper on the same subject without having even read the studies made by the provincial officers. Just as people in regional districts are entitled to protest against their provincial Government when this one establishes on its own authority and on an unilateral basis programs which affect them in their daily life, so provincial Governments should be entitled, I think, to complain about such a situation. And, on the contrary, it can be said that some programs which affect the whole of Canadian life are developed at the provincial level whereas they should also be subject to consultations. (3.60:32)

One witness indicated that making Federal-Provincial conferences institutions in a formal way is simply recognizing what has already happened:

It is a fact that the federal institution that is not mentioned in the present Federal constitution—the Dominion-Provincial conferences—has rapidly been taking on all the characteristics of a standing arbitral committee for Federal-Provincial problems; and if this trend should continue one would expect further institutionalisation for the Dominion-Provincial conference, as for example the creation of a standing, possibly joint Dominion-Provincial, secretariat, and also some degree of public or private recording of the deliberations of the body. Not too much has been published on the Dominion-Provincial conferences that is of an analytical character, but I would venture the opinion today that such conferences are the pivot of the present Canadian federal constitutional system. (3.10:54)

The need for cooperation between governments is widely recognized. Article 48 of the Victoria Charter states:

A Conference composed of the Prime Minister of Canada and the First Ministers of the Provinces shall be called by the Prime Minister of Canada at least once a year, unless, in any year, a majority of those composing the Conference decide that it shall not be held.

We feel that such a conference would be most useful, and we hope that its climate would be more in the nature of an exchange of views on current joint problems rather than of a negotiating session as such. Perhaps special sessions of the conference could be called after any spe-

cific program had been broadly worked out between the governments in order to negotiate the total package. We also recommend that a further meeting, on a tri-level basis (i.e., including municipalities), be held annually at the highest political level. These meetings, again, we hope, would be for the purpose of exchanging views and keeping abreast of developments throughout the country.

We would expect some criticism of our proposals on the basis that such conferences might undermine the parliamentary and legislative roles and reduce legislative bodies to mere rubber stamps. It would indeed be ironic for a committee of legislators like ourselves to produce such a result. We certainly do not intend it. By way of defence we would utilize the words of one constitutionalist:

First, is there a threat to parliamentary and democratic government in the development of more regular and systematic intergovernmental cooperation for the coordinated use of federal and provincial powers that are not much changed from what they are now? This should not be viewed as an antidemocratic development, though some commentators and editors will have us believe that it is.

Because of the Cabinet system, the ministers who engage in intergovernmental consultations are responsible to their respective democratic parliamentary bodies for the policies they sponsor, the concessions they make and the agreements they sign. The policies and agreements can be considered and debated under many different procedural arrangements in the Parliament of Canada and the legislatures of the provinces to ensure the accountability of ministers and senior officials to their respective parliamentary bodies and so to the people itself. (3.6:14)

Being on a regular basis called for by the Constitution, Federal-Provincial conferences of First Ministers would tend not to assume "do or die" proportions as some recent conferences have in the media. The focus of attention, so to speak, would be on the marriage, not on the wedding.

We further recommend the appointment of a Federal Minister of State for Intergovernmental Relations. Because of the importance we attach to conferences at the political level, as well as to the new structures we propose for Federal-Provincial Committees of officials, we believe a continuous and comprehensive overview is required. We envisage a Minister of State for Intergovernmental Relations relatively free of purely departmental priorities, so that his field would be the larger perspective of liaison and cooperation. It makes sense to ease the load of other Federal ministers through a new minister who could look after both communication with other governments as an objective in itself and the general advocacy of Federal policies and programs. Of course, a special conference on a specific topic, e.g. health, would probably still find the Minister of Health as the main Federal representative at the conference. The function of the new Minister of State would be of a more day-to-day nature, and he would have

more time to visit the provincial capitals to enhance cooperation and coordination of the two levels of government on a person-to-person basis.

At the level of officials, we propose that the present procedures be radically altered. We were told that there were more than 175 committees which meet with many subjects of joint concern to the Federal and Provincial Governments. We suspect that this structure grew to meet the contingencies of the day. These committees should be greatly reduced in number and put on a more functional basis. Without further study it is not possible to say precisely how many there should be, but we suspect their number could be dramatically reduced.

By reducing the numbers and giving to a single committee a mandate over a whole function, e.g. natural resources, we would expect that the prestige of the committee would be enhanced, and we also envisage that members of the committees would be drawn from the most senior levels of the Federal and Provincial Governments. These committees could take a broad perspective of each function, and would improve coordination of the planning and administrative policies of both levels of government. Because they would exercise jurisdiction at the highest official levels in their functioning, we would expect more real and permanent "decisions" to be taken and the consensus reached to be more meaningful. In line with this consolidation we recommend that a Federal-Provincial secretariat be established to enhance coordination. Of course, these bodies are neither executive nor legislative, and any decisions reached would have to be adopted by the Cabinets concerned, and, where legislation was required, by Parliament and the Legislatures.

The aim of this recommendation is to ensure that all information, particularly in the area of planning, flows to the highest official levels in both Federal and Provincial Governments. By this technique Canada would, we hope, avoid the possibility of major government planning being carried on by one government without any knowledge on the part of other governments. While it cannot entirely eliminate uncoordinated planning as long as any government may wish to surprise other governments, it can avoid situations where the lack of information results from structural impediments rather than from a desire to conceal.

We wish to make it unmistakably clear that we do not see intergovernmental cooperation as only an opening of the Federal decision-making process to Provincial input. The converse must also be true, for cooperation is not a one-way street. The Provinces cannot expect to control the Federal budget unless they are willing to have their budgets, in turn, subject to veto by Ottawa. But what we have in mind is actually somewhat less dramatic than decisional control on either side, though no less complete than frank disclosure of policy intentions and genuine willingness to discuss alternative courses of action. Provided that this degree of cooperation was mutually achieved, that would be revolutionary enough to impart a new direction to Confederation.

Chapter 22—Municipalities

RECOMMENDATIONS

64. While we recognize the difficulties of larger cities in providing for their needs, financing their programs and determining their own priorities, as well as in negotiating with the Provincial and Federal Governments on works which seriously affect municipal planning, and also their need for more status and more autonomy in order to achieve these goals, we do not see how these matters can be entrenched in the Constitution. They should be negotiated between the cities and the Provincial Governments under whose jurisdiction they fall.
65. The municipalities in each Province, in conjunction with their provincial and national bodies, should determine which representatives from what municipalities would attend the annual tri-level conferences we have recommended in Recommendation 63.
66. Such tri-level meetings would not have the power of veto over any Federal or Provincial programs but would rather operate by way of moral suasion.
67. In the light of the injustice done municipalities by their having to rely on the property tax for the bulk of their revenue, there should be a sharing of tax fields between Governments that would allow municipalities direct access to other sources of revenue.
68. Where feasible, representatives of municipalities should meet with other levels of government to discuss common problems particularly in the area of economic planning through representation at meetings of the Ministers of Finance and Provincial Treasurers.

Undoubtedly one of the major themes in the evidence heard by the Committee was the challenge of Canadian urbanism. Mayors and aldermen from municipal corporations, from the largest to some of the smallest, impressed on us the concerns of cities: dialogue with senior governments, administrative policies, pollution, the revenue squeeze, welfare costs, transportation, and housing, to name but a few. These elected representatives, and Canadians generally, are aware of current projections which show that by the turn of this century approximately 80 to 85 per cent of Canadians will be urban dwellers. In addition, the growth of some of our larger cities, notably Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver, may well produce urban changes not only of degree, but perhaps of kind.

The implications of having two cities in Canada with populations each greater than six million persons are many. To what extent these enormous population explosions should affect the structures of urban government and its relations with other governments has greatly concerned us.

Witnesses who appeared before us stressed various possibilities ranging from the status quo to city provinces. A few excerpts from the evidence may help to indicate the range of views:

I think the constitution has spelled out very clearly that this level of government has certain rights. Unfortunately, at the moment, the municipalities in this province really have no rights at all. They are completely dominated and controlled in every way by the province and not wisely.

The municipalities supply more service to the people than any other level of government but they have the most limited form of taxation.

Most assuredly the constitution has to give rights to municipalities and have them very clearly spelled out . . .

Metropolitan Toronto is like the committee that designed a horse. It came out a camel.

The people who decide what Toronto is going to be do not even live here. We have a very bad form of government. "It is metro". "No, it is municipal." "It is the borough's responsibility." "No, no. This road ends here and it becomes the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto down the block." It is very confused. (3.61:34)

It must have authority to collect income to meet its needs; it must know what it can do; it must be able to plan and know how it can raise funds to do so.

These are all the problems that exist because the city has no definite authority. I think one of our great hopes . . . is that this Committee will recommend that the municipal governments of Canada, the 4,200 of them, have rights spelled out just as citizens have rights and the provinces have authority and rights. I think it is essential if we are going to survive. (3.61:35)

Another witness said:

I suggest that what we have attempted to do is to reflect on the existing situation and to consider what

might be in the future. The question really centers on the need for some constitutional recognition of the third level of government and the difficulty of the 4,500 municipalities as opposed to 10 provinces and a single federal government . . .

In fact, because we have that problem we recognize that the rate of the level of constitutional recognition that can be afforded to the 4,500 municipalities of Canada today is almost impossible. In a redrafted constitution we want you to provide for the future possibility that those municipalities might be reconstructed into a very much smaller number of units and so constructed that when they come together they in fact might well be recognized as a constitutional entity and a third level of government without the hangup of multiplicity of jurisdiction which presently exists . . . We are reasonably and objectively attempting to recognize today's circumstances, but we are asking you not to lock us out constitutionally of the opportunity to be recognized as a third level of government when the municipal reconstruction that we hope will take place in fact does take place. (3.50:26)

Another witness, an alderman, said:

I consider that the relationships between municipalities and the provinces and the federal government are drastically in need of review. This concept of municipalities being the creatures of a provincial government may have had some validity in 1867, but it has none now. To give you one specific example of the situation in which municipalities find themselves.

The provincial government arbitrarily changed the cost-sharing program with respect to welfare and whereas two years ago we paid as a municipality only 10 per cent of welfare costs and the provincial 40 per cent and the federal 50 per cent, we now have to assume 20 per cent or double the cost of welfare . . . This has meant an increase in per capita from 98 cents to \$1.58. Specifically . . . this means in one year an increase of \$300,000 in our welfare costs. We have 85 per cent of our revenue derived from residential taxation. So there has to be some drastic re-appraisal of this relationship: some sort of direct channel between perhaps the federal government and the municipal government along the lines they have in some American cities and their federal government. We have to do something, or many of our municipalities are facing a really severe financial crisis. (3.27:62)

A brief from one city stated:

We also support the resolution on constitutional reform adopted by the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities at their annual meeting in Halifax, June 9 to 11, 1970 . . .

1. That full consideration should be given in the redrafting of the Canadian constitution to the question of the status of municipal government as another jurisdiction with powers and responsibilities appropriate to its role in Canadian public life.

2. That in the review of the constitution of Canada currently in progress, the Government of Canada, together with the Provinces, provide for the participation of municipal representatives as equal partners in the process of the redrafting of the Canadian constitution.

3. And that pending more permanent solutions to the problems of local government in Canada steps be taken as soon as possible to provide municipal governments with a role in public policy development more appropriate to their responsibilities, and with sources of revenue more consistent with the accelerating demands made by the growth of municipal responsibilities, either by way of increased taxing powers, a system of shared taxes or by transfer payments from federal and/or provincial governments more adequate to the needs of the developing situation.

4. That in all matters which directly or indirectly concern the questions of local government in Canada, the Government of Canada and the Governments of the Provinces seek the advice of and consult with municipal Governments concerned, either specifically in the case of projects of limited impact or through the municipalities' appointed representatives in matters of general application. (3.45:8)

A brief from a major Canadian city said:

The second recommendation is that such centres as Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, and whatever other representation is thought to be fair with other municipalities, be given the immediate right to participate in discussions concerning constitutional revision . . .

In the long term the large area municipalities in Canada designated as such by the National Urban Council, should be given entrenched rights in the constitution. Another arrangement should be made for the access to taxing powers commensurate with the responsibilities of governing major urban centres. (3.63:13)

A Committee member asked the following question:

I understand your brief to reject the idea that we could set out in a new constitution a third level of government with precise powers and resources, and that at the present stage, at any rate, you think that would be unworkable. (3.50:13)

And the reply was:

Right. We think that the local level of government ought to be recognized by being referred to in the constitution, and if for example the revised constitution referred to the place of federal-provincial conferences as a part of the governmental structure of Canada, it should also refer to federal-provincial-municipal conferences which will guarantee the kind of consultation which will be of benefit to the provinces and the federal government as well as to the municipal end. (3.50:13)

One witness made some reference to the American experience:

The argument that in redrafting the constitution the local governments should have some special status and should participate as equal partners in the process of redrafting seems to me, gets into very slippery territory. The Americans have had enormous trouble in their state constitutions with their concept of home

rule where they have tried to entrench local governments within state constitutions. (3.45:28)

One expert made the following observation in reply to a question:

You are suggesting a right of consultation written into the constitution. We are not the only federal government with a written constitution. Are there any illustrations of where this has been done, or if it has been done, whether it has worked at all? Or are we asked to pioneer in this field?

I would have to say I do not know. I am not aware of any. I find federal constitutions are very difficult to put on a comparative basis. They differ so widely from place to place that I have never found this a very successful operation. I would have to say I do not know, but I think you are probably right that if there is, it is quite rare. (3.50:41)

The following comment was made concerning the enforcement of the right to consultation:

You rely on moral suasion rather than litigation? Oh, I think so. Public pressure. (3.50:37)

It is readily apparent that there are many possibilities open to us when we consider the role of the municipality in Canadian life.

Briefly, the major options may be summarized as follows:

- That municipal legislative powers be spelled out in considerable detail in the Constitution thereby assuring a clear and recognizable place for city governments;
- That municipal revenue sources be spelled out in the Constitution, e.g., a certain fixed percentage of personal or corporate income taxes;
- That municipalities be given the right to be consulted on all major matters undertaken by the two senior levels of government which affect them and that this right be recognized in the Constitution;
- That the Constitution make no change in the present status or rights of municipal government;
- That greater efforts be made to coordinate planning and legislation by both senior levels of governments to include participation, on an informal basis, of municipal representatives at both the elected and official levels.

We reject the option that no change be made in the present status or rights of municipal governments. We are convinced from the evidence we have heard all across Canada that our third level of government requires a new focus of attention, and more effective means of presenting its point of view to the two senior levels of governments. We believe these objectives can be attained, however, without adopting the view that municipal legislative powers should be spelled out in considerable detail in the Constitution; this would not attack the central problem, and it would not allow the Provinces to set up municipal governmental structures which could be tailored to the specific needs of each Province. For example, those Provinces with very large cities might require quite different

municipal structures from those with much smaller cities. The constitutional entrenchment of the powers of municipal governments is thus in our view too blunt an instrument.

Consequently we believe the difficulties of municipalities in providing for their needs, financing their programs, and determining their own priorities cannot be effectively resolved by the recognition of municipal governments in the Constitution of Canada. To the extent that constitutional recognition and protection might be afforded major Canadian cities by defining their status in Provincial constitutions, those matters can be negotiated with the respective Provincial Governments in whose jurisdiction they lie.

Spokesmen for municipal corporations across Canada raised over and over again the financial plight of their governments. Their major concerns included: pleas for greater fiscal resources, and, sometimes, transfers of taxing powers; criticism of the real property tax as too rigid a tax base; the interference with municipal priorities because of Federal and Provincial grant schemes, particularly those of the "matching" variety; and the involvement of municipalities in "provincial" services like education, welfare and housing, without adequate revenues. In terms of aggregate spending the importance of municipal governments cannot be overstated. Approximately one third of all public expenditures in Canada are made by municipalities.

We are sympathetic to these financial problems. Without attempting to analyze in quantitative terms the adequacy or inadequacy of real property taxes as the basis of municipal revenues, it is apparent that they are regressive and often inequitable. The pressure of such taxes (through rents, for example) bears down on lower-income groups, and it obviously is not a user-based tax when one considers the number of older property owners who pay real estate taxes for educational purposes despite the fact that they have no children in schools. In relation to municipal expenditures, real property taxes do not have the growth potential of income taxes, and municipal representatives argue that this lack of growth potential built into real property taxation constantly puts municipalities in a fiscal bind. On the other hand, Canada has not had too much experience with earmarking specific percentages of income taxes for particular purposes, and the possibility of differential income tax rates from city to city would be a totally new dimension in the Canadian tax structure.

On balance we do not favour the approach of a specified and guaranteed percentage of income tax. We feel that to the extent that any significant percentage would help the municipal financial plight, it would reduce the fiscal and monetary leverage of the Federal Government.

However, we consider it unjust that municipalities should have to rely on the property base for the bulk of their revenues, and we therefore recommend a sharing of tax fields between the different levels of government that would grant to municipalities direct access to other sources of revenue.

We do not seek to avoid radically new approaches to urban policy. We see in a readjustment of access to tax revenues an alleviation of some of the anomalies and pressures faced by the cities of Canada. We know too that

there are different types of conferences involving various levels of government and many of these would be appropriate forums for the municipalities. A conference on the Constitution, on health, or on arrangements for native peoples might not lend themselves readily to municipal representation, but conferences dealing with welfare, housing, transportation and coordination of fiscal policy obviously would be much more relevant to the cities and towns of Canada.

That majority of Canadians who now live in cities are no longer satisfied to be unrepresented in forums where

policy decisions are taken affecting the way they live. Transportation, welfare, housing, cultural amenities, and pollution abatement are but a short list of concerns which will require decisions by all levels of government, preferably by governments acting in concert.

City living can be restful and satisfying. It should be possible for those who represent city people in all levels of government to find coordinated means of reaching the goal of a better urban way of life.

Chapter 23—The Territories

RECOMMENDATIONS

69. The objective of Government policy for the Yukon and the Northwest Territories should be the fostering of self-government and provincial status.
70. The provisions of the British North America Act, 1871, section 2, which provide for the admission of new provinces by action of the Federal Government alone, should be continued, provided that no territory should become a province without its consent.
71. The Yukon and the Northwest Territories should each be entitled to representation in the Senate.

Vast, starkly beautiful, and peopled by self-reliant and adventuresome Canadians, the Canadian North is a part of Canada seen by all too few of our citizens. Its potential, we are convinced, is enormous. Its growing pains are many. But as Canadians we have a unique opportunity in this new land not to repeat past errors. We can make the kind of North all Canadians, including Northerners, want without being trapped by precedent or being fearful of the future.

The key constitutional demands of Northern Canadians come under such headings as "responsible government", "provincial status", and "control over natural resources". It is important for all Canadians to understand that Northern Canadians, those who live in our two territories, do not have exactly the same relationship to the institutions governing them as Canadians living in provinces do. In order to appreciate more fully the situation in the Canadian North we shall set out here some geographic, ethnic, and historical factors.

Canada's northern territories are 1,511,979 square miles in area. The Northwest Territories covers 1,304,903 square miles, which is greater than the combined area of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. This represents almost 35 per cent of the total area of Canada, yet its population of approximately 32,000 is less than 1/5 of 1 per cent of the total Canadian population. The population density is 2 persons per 100 square miles as compared with 950 persons per 100 square miles for the Canadian provinces.

The Yukon Territory, with its 207,076 square miles, is equal in area to the four Atlantic Provinces. With a population estimated at approximately 20,000, it has a density of 10 persons per 100 square miles. The population is largely centred around the capital, Whitehorse, which con-

tains half of the Yukon's inhabitants. The rest live in communities along the Alaska Highway, in service centres and in mining communities.

The native peoples' population, an important part of the total population of the North, is especially significant in the Northwest Territories. Indians and Eskimos make up only 1 per cent of the total population in Canada, yet in the Northwest Territories the majority of the population is Eskimo (33 per cent) and Indian (19 per cent). Moreover, of the remaining 48 per cent of population, almost one-fifth are Métis, living under the same social and economic conditions as the Indian people. The native peoples' population is a relatively smaller proportion of the total population of the Yukon Territory, viz., about 16 per cent.

Geological Surveys have indicated that Canada's Northern Territories are potentially extremely rich in mineral deposits and in oil and gas. In the Yukon, for example, mining production has increased more than twofold in value since 1967. The Yukon also has an estimated 64,500 cubic miles of potential oil-bearing sediments.

As far as the Northwest Territories is concerned, of the 1.7 million square miles of precambrian rock in Canada, 710,000 square miles lie within the Territories; and the mineral wealth of the precambrian shield in the northern parts of Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba has been amply demonstrated. The Northwest Territories has an estimated 930,633 cubic miles of potential oil-bearing sediments as compared with the 341,715 cubic miles in Alberta. The discovery of massive oil reserves at Prudhoe Bay in Alaska has naturally raised hopes that similar large reserves of oil and gas will be found in the Territories, perhaps in the adjacent Mackenzie Delta or in the Arctic Islands. A major oil rush has developed in the North since the Prudhoe Bay discovery.

The early history of government in the Yukon is shared with the Prairie Provinces. Canada acquired Rupert's Land and the North-western Territory shortly after Confederation. The temporary Government Act of 1869 provided for the first administration. It applied to the present provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and northern parts of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the Northern Territories as well as the Yukon Territory. The influx of miners to the Klondike gold fields led to the establishment of the Yukon as a separate territory in 1898.

The first Government of the Territory consisted of a Commissioner and a Council of not more than six members appointed by the Governor in Council to aid the Commissioner in the administration of the Territory. The Council included the judges of the Territorial Court, who were also appointed by the Governor in Council. The Commissioner in Council was given legislative powers similar to those held by the Lieutenant-Governor and the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories. The Yukon Act was amended in 1899 to increase the membership of the Council to eight by the addition of two elected members who were to hold office for two years. In 1902, provision was made for three more elected members, raising the Council membership to eleven.

A fully-elected Council of ten members was introduced in 1908, when the Commissioner was prohibited from sitting in Council. In 1918 the Governor in Council was given authority by an amendment to the Yukon Act to abolish the elected Council and to substitute an appointed Council of two or more members. Second thoughts in 1919, however, led to the amendment of the Act again to provide for three elected members on the Council. From 1919 until the end of World War II, the Territorial Government remained virtually unchanged. Increased population and rising prosperity made it reasonable to increase the size of the Council to five elected members in 1951.

Between 1908 and 1960 there developed a strong tradition of separate legislative and executive powers. Frequent misunderstandings and sometimes deadlock occurred between the two branches of government. Some improvement was made in 1960 when the prohibition against the Commissioner sitting in Council was removed. In addition a Financial Advisory Committee, consisting of three members of the Council, was established to review territorial estimates before their presentation to the Council.

In 1965, further changes were made. A Budget Programming Committee was set up which includes the three members of the Financial Advisory Committee and three senior members of the Territorial Administration. Under this arrangement, the Budget Programming Committee works out the estimates for each Department with the appropriate Department Heads. Previously, the Financial Advisory Committee had only reviewed these estimates after they had been prepared by the Department Heads and approved by the Commissioner. Now the estimates are processed through the Committee and the elected Council members are involved in the actual preparation of the estimates. Further developments respecting an executive committee will be discussed later.

As in the Yukon, the early history of government in the Northwest Territories is linked with that of the Prairie Provinces. When Saskatchewan and Alberta became Provinces, the government of the remaining Northwest Territories reverted to that existing prior to 1870: an appointed Commissioner had control over all phases of government. Elected representation completely disappeared. In 1905 a Council of four appointed members was created, but no appointments were made for sixteen years. A Commissioner was appointed with all the powers previously enjoyed by the Lieutenant-Governor, the Executive and the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories. Finally, in 1921, the Council already provided for by the Act of 1905 was appointed, along with two

additional members. From 1922 to 1930 few ordinances were passed, and in some years the Council did not meet at all. Until 1946 it was composed entirely of senior Federal Government officials. In that year the first territorial resident was appointed to Council. In 1951 three elected members were added for the Mackenzie District, and a fourth in 1954. After 1960, the practice of appointing Federal officials to the Council ceased, and members of the public were appointed instead, generally from outside the Territories. Three more elected members were added in 1966, and in 1967 a territorial resident was appointed to the full-time post of Deputy Commissioner.

The office of the Commissioner has had a varied history. From 1905 to 1918, the Commissioner of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police was also Commissioner of the Northwest Territories. From 1918 to 1963, the Deputy Minister of the Department of the Interior and his successors held the office. The first full-time Commissioner was appointed in 1963.

As we have already indicated, the constitutional aspirations of Canadians living in Canada's two territories are, because of the governmental structures prevailing there, necessarily more ambitious than those of Canadians elsewhere.

The vast majority of those who spoke to the Committee ultimately wanted, in a word, what other Canadians now have.

We shall set forth under several headings some of the views we heard.

A. Responsible Government

Governmental reform, whereby the policy making function is democratically placed in the hands of the people through their elected representatives, is supported. . . .

This brief urges an increase in the Territorial Council to 15 elected members, and supports the idea of a commissioner to be one of the elected members, and directed by the Territorial Council. The executive committee, which is about to be formed, should concurrently with the increase in the number of Territorial Councillors, be formed so as to provide for a majority of elected members with plans to phase out the presence of appointed members entirely. Consequent amendments to the Yukon Act to eliminate the colonial nature of the present government organization would be required as each step was taken, culminating in the amendment of Section 4 of the Yukon Act to provide for a fully responsible government in the same general terms as is now held by the provinces of Canada. (2.16:33)

A plan should be initiated for the more rapid development of responsible government in the Northwest Territories with a fully elected legislature and the immediate inclusion of elected members in the administration. In effect, the Northwest Territories government is very new, very progressive and has done a great deal. We are just asking that it be given the opportunity to do more.

We in the Northwest Territories stand in a colonial status in that we function under a commissioner and a

partially elected council. We are not dissatisfied with this, but we think things can be done better so we ask for a plan as soon as possible to meet obligations with the rest of Canada that this be carried out for a fully responsible territorial government and that almost immediately we would ask that elected members be made part of the Northwest Territories administration as has been initiated in the Yukon recently. (3.87:7)

I agree with the suggestion that has been made by the Minister in relation to the two appointments by the Territorial Council of two members of the Executive Committee headed by the Commissioner in conjunction with a makeup of the Commissioner, his two assistant Commissioners and two elected representatives on the committee. This is something that is outside the legislative body of the Yukon Act and because it is outside the legislative body of the Yukon Act gives the right to the Minister or the Commissioner on the say-so of the Minister to remove that Executive Committee that he has set up at any time. (2.16:17)

These comments are made in the light of the present legislation governing the Yukon Territory. That legislation provides that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development or the Governor in Council shall have the authority to direct the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, from time to time, on the way the Territory is to be governed. The Commissioner is appointed by the Minister. The Territorial Council is in law advisory only. Two of the members of the popularly elected, seven-man council sit on the Executive Committee with three appointed members, the Commissioner as chairman and two assistant commissioners. The Executive Committee is to be consulted by the Commissioner and its advice is to be given full consideration. The two popularly elected members of the Executive Committee have "line" or administrative responsibility for two departments of the Territorial Government, analogous to that of a Federal or Provincial cabinet minister. There is, however, no obligation on the Executive Committee to resign in the event that its decisions are not supported by a majority of members in the Territorial Council. There is no responsible government in the Yukon Territory—or in the Northwest Territories for that matter—in the constitutional sense of the term. Indeed, the Northwest Territories does not yet have the popular participation in the Executive Committee that the Yukon Territory has.

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development summed up his views on the Yukon experiment in these words:

I suggest to you that the wisest course would be to permit the Territorial Government to develop its potential in the context of the new Executive Committee which has the responsibility for those matters which lie within its legislative framework. I cannot predict at this time what form future constitutional development will take. However, my approach to this question is a flexible and experimental one, allowing for further adjustments as experience is gained and as the population and the economy of the Yukon continue to expand. (3.18:8)

B. Provincial Status

Many Yukoners have expressed their desire for political evolution that would permit the Yukon to ultimately reach a constitutional status equal to that of the provinces.

For some unpredictable period in the immediate future, mining interests need assurance that the federal government funds will be obtainable to provide the missing logistic support needed to bring a mine into production, such as roads, power townsites, etc. As the economic base of the Yukon grows, this assurance could gradually be assumed at the Territorial level. (2.14:7)

I would like to re-emphasize something the brief is attempting to accomplish, that it is not trying to put a time limit on when the Territory becomes a province. This would be something to be decided by others, preferably by our local politicians. But the brief is intended to present a formula whereby there would be a transition, first, the administration of everything affecting the Yukon in the Yukon, and secondly, evolution to provincial status at some undetermined time. (2.14:25)

Generally this brief finds difficulty in accepting that there be established a point of development of the Territory, at which time provincial status would be available to the area upon its request. It is felt that the present sections of the British North America Act of 1871 remain the machinery for obtaining provincial status, and the matter proceed as outlined above in the brief without specific targets of population, gross territorial production or total local government revenues being fixed, since none of these factors are in themselves decisive of the matter, and upon the theory that all democratic institutions should be available to all citizens of the country, the setting of artificial targets for such does not seem to be appropriate. (2.16:35)

I feel that the time has come when the Yukon must take over its own and go into provincial status. I have heard the remarks that the time is not ripe. That is ridiculous for the simple reason that until we do have provincial status we will never get industry into the Yukon. At the present time we have potential mining companies who, in the very, very near future, will be opening up mines but that is not the only thing. We must get others than mining; we must get industry into these Territories. (2.13:7)

[Floor Questioner] I do not believe in complete election for all offices of the administration in the Yukon. Is there one case where an appointed member has not come up to . . . expectations?

[Witness] Mr. Chairman, the brief is not intended as a criticism. It is intended as a suggestion on constitutional reform for constitutional reasons. I think the simple answer is "no".

[Floor Questioner] I believe that some of these appointees from Ottawa do a much better job than some of the people who would be elected here. (2.16:50)

I have not in my own view come up with any political boundaries for the provinces in the North. We might have a combination of the Yukon and the Mackenzie. We might have the Great Slave Lake area as one particular province. Whether we have one or four I think will depend on developments as they progress through northern Canada. So I cannot give a direct answer in terms of size, numbers, or the various combinations, other than to say that I think the objective north of the 60th Parallel must be the creation of provinces within the framework of Canada. (3.86:36)

These excerpts from the evidence indicate that the consensus is not complete on the issue of provincial status in the territories, and certainly not on the timing of any grant of Provincial status. The implications of Provincial status are many, but the main concern appears to be the ability of the territories to generate enough revenues of their own to enable them to carry on as Provinces. Tied in with this is, of course, the small population of the territories, and the extra cost involved in providing "provincial style" services in the Canadian North. Some Canadians in the south see the granting of provincial status as conferring too great an economic benefit, if not immediately, then ultimately on Canada's northern residents:

With regard to the northern territories, my first concern is that they not be given provincial status particularly with the population situation as it is now because I suggest that it would make living in those territories an extremely attractive proposition. If they had all the resources turned over to them tomorrow, they could almost declare a dividend and retire on the spot.

Either those territories are going to continue to be governed from Ottawa as territories or some arrangement has to be made for internal self-government or for some sort of union. I do not see in the immediate time that internal self-government in the territories is a proposition that would benefit the rest of Canada or even be particularly viable in those territories. (3.1:18)

On the other hand, we heard also from southern Canadians who were very sympathetic to the aspirations of northerners for a greater say in the government of their part of Canada.

C. Control of Natural Resources

It is only in this context that the average person can appreciate what it means to the Yukon's constitutional aspirations to have our natural resources heritage stolen from us by official Ottawa dictates. It means that without the revenues from our natural resources we can never be self-supporting as the provinces are. Our natural resources are our life's blood because we have a resource-oriented economy. If we cannot claim our natural resources, then it is also certain that we can never make the claim to self-determination or self-government. We shall be doomed forever to the status of second-class citizenship, always begging the federal government for "handouts" on which to subsist, and always being underdeveloped because we shall not have the revenues on hand with which to develop our area. On a smaller scale our position will be similar to Canada's always handing over control of our natural resources to outsiders in exchange for

funds with which to develop our area, but losing more and more control over the area that we are developing because others are supplying the capital and they are demanding a bigger voice in the future. We would remain always an economic colony. (2.16:60)

I think the mineral rights of the provinces go to the provincial governments and it seems to me that it is strange indeed that the Parliament of Canada can set up the mineral rights of the Northwest Territories and say that they are the rights of all Canadians. I feel that in any kind of a setup of government in the Territories, and eventual provincial status, that certainly the mineral rights or the minerals in the Territories should become a part of the Territories and be used to support the people who are living and working in the North. (3.86:39)

Eventually, of course, I think that control should be in the hands of the people who own them. But prior to that, I think we should have a clear statement as to who owns them.

We have had a statement to date telling us that the resources of the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories belong to the federal government. They called it the people of Canada which I take to mean the federal government. This is ownership we are talking about, not control. They are denying that Yukoners own their own natural resources, and we are the only place in Canada where this is done. Certainly no one would suggest that in a province without fear of getting shot. But in the Yukon, they seem to be able to get away with it.

As to control, at the outset, my personal opinion is this. I want immediately a clear statement from the federal government saying that the resources in the Yukon are ours; that they are being held in trust for us by the federal government. I would be quite prepared to allow the federal government to control them until such time as we are capable of taking over control and management of the resources ourselves.

Until that time I would not argue about an interim period whereby the federal government controls resources.

There is a historical precedent for this. All of the Western provinces went through this stage—Manitoba, British Columbia, and so on and so forth. At no time was it denied that the actual ownership of their resources belonged to the people within the provinces or in their areas. (2.16:66)

The position of the Government of Canada on this issue was put this way by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development:

I have asked what we would do with the resources. Are we going to keep them in a trusteeship for the residents of the North or are they to be shared by the whole population of Canada? It is a fundamental question. Some resolutions have been taken on this problem. Some people think that they should benefit all Canadians; others think that we should keep them under trusteeship for the Northwest residents. Up to now, the government has been quite neutral, that is to say, we do not keep them under trusteeship and we have not made a final decision, on

a long-term basis. But as you said, this question should perhaps be debated by the Constitution Committee which should submit a report. The Cabinet would certainly be very grateful to know your opinion on the subject. (3.18:25)

The financial capacity of any territory should not be the only factor to be considered in granting it responsible government or provincial status. Certainly some of the people of the North believe there are other factors—not the least of which is full democratic participation of all Canadians in every level of government—which are also very important. The Government of Canada itself has stated that it does “not regard the financial capacity of the Territory as an absolute criterion of political development.” (3.18:16) The difference, then, is not one of principle. From the evidence it even seems to boil down, almost, to one of accounting. In the Yukon particularly we were told that Government of Canada figures do not take into account all the revenues which emanate from the Territory. In turn, the Minister replied in these terms:

We sometimes hear comments that the finances of the Yukon are kept obscure because we do not wish to publish this information. I can assure you that this is not true. In fact, all the figures are public, but we have to admit that the financial pattern is complex and therefore difficult to interpret. I made an attempt to cast some light on this in November 1969. With this in mind, I think, it would be useful to review the matter again now, and perhaps emphasize the fact that the financial data are accessible for examination.

Appropriations for 1970-71 provide for Territorial Government expenditures of over \$25 million. Of this amount \$5.5 million will come from the Yukon's own revenue. \$6.7 million will come from the federal government under cost-sharing programs similar to those arranged with the provinces. The remainder which is nearly \$13 million comes from the federal treasury. Of that \$13 million about \$2 million could be considered as the abatement of personal and corporate income tax which the Yukon would get if it were a province.

This still is not the complete picture because there are many hidden costs in provincial type services in the Yukon for which the federal government pays directly. Some of these are the costs of the courts and the RCMP, that is to say, about \$1.25 million. There is another sum, nearly \$500,000, that is paid through the present subsidized patient day-rate at the Whitehorse General Hospital. The full cost of all new road construction in the Yukon as well as all costs for a number of other provincial-type services are paid directly by the federal departments concerned. (3.18:6)

The Minister then provided the Committee with a breakdown of revenues, and projected an estimated deficit, if the Yukon were a province, in 1970-71 of \$24,689,183. (3.18:58)

Of course, as already mentioned, fiscal capacity is not an absolute criterion. When linked, however, with a sparse population, a still developing infrastructure, and the special needs of native peoples in both Territories, it shows the difficulties in moving immediately to complete self-government and provincial status. When these factors are combined with the very real problems in communications in the North, both natural and man-made, a timetable approach raises many difficulties.

It is fair to say that the evidence generally in the Territories, and in the Yukon particularly, did not demand either self-government or provincial status immediately. Most witnesses were concerned that there be some timetable of development in constitutional affairs and that the criteria be set out in the Constitution. When any territory met these predetermined criteria, complete self government and provincial status would follow automatically. There are immense practical difficulties in this approach. If all the criteria were set out in the Constitution (assuming they could be agreed upon with sufficient certainty) it is possible a territory might qualify on all but one. Consequently, a constitutional amendment might be required in order to change the one criterion. This approach has these built-in inflexibilities. On the other hand, it is not reassuring to Northern Canadians to leave their future constitutional development completely evolutionary.

We feel that the best approach would be for the Government of Canada to make the following commitment to its Northern citizens: that the objective of northern policy is to foster full self-government and Provincial status for the territories. Administrative and legislative policies in so far as they concern the structure of government in the North should be tested against and advance this objective.

Because of the special relationship between the Parliament of Canada and the Territories, an eventual decision to admit these territories to the status of provinces should be made by the Parliament of Canada pursuant to section 2 of the British North America Act, 1871, provided that no territory should become a Province without its consent. Some provision would also have to be made at that time as to how the consent of these areas would be counted for purposes of the constitutional amending procedure and of the spending power formula.

In order to improve communications between Ottawa and the Territories at the Parliamentary level, we advocate immediate Senate representation for each of the two territories. Under the constitutional rule that a Province cannot have fewer Members in the Commons than the Senate, the appointment of two Senators for each territory would lead to an increase in the number of Members of Parliament to two for each.

Chapter 24—Offshore Mineral Rights

RECOMMENDATIONS

72. The Federal Government should have proprietary rights over the seabed offshore to the limit of Canada's internationally recognized jurisdiction, and the Federal Parliament should have full legislative jurisdiction over this subject matter.
73. There should be no constitutional provision as to the sharing of the profits from the exploitation of seabed resources. Nevertheless, we feel strongly that the Federal Government should share the profits of seabed development equally with the adjacent coastal Province rather than with all of the Provinces.
74. Sable Island should be recognized by the Constitution as part of the Province of Nova Scotia.

The question of the ownership of the seabed and the continental shelf offshore from a country's land mass is even newer in national than in international law. Under international law it was traditional that every country had the ownership of the soil under the internal waters inside the baselines from which territorial waters are measured, as well as the seabed under the territorial waters outside the baselines (whatever the location of the baselines or the accepted width of those waters may be). Then, under the Geneva Convention of 1958, national states were assigned "sovereign rights" for the purpose of exploring their continental shelves and exploiting their natural resources—not quite full sovereignty, but complete control for practical purposes. In the Convention "continental shelf" was defined as the seabed and its subsoil beyond territorial waters to a depth of 200 metres, or beyond that limit to where the depth of the waters admits of the exploitation of natural resources.

Within Canada, until the advisory opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in November of 1967, there was no authoritative statement of the legal position between governments with respect to offshore subsoil. The Supreme Court opinion, delivered with respect to areas off the west coasts, was that the Federal Government is entitled to proprietary and other rights offshore from the historic boundaries of British Columbia, which it defined as the ordinary low-water mark. The reasoning of the Court makes it clear that there is nothing in the result peculiar to the Province of British Columbia, and that all rights in submerged lands lying outside the low-water marks of the Provinces belong to the Federal Government.

This decision was received with great dissatisfaction by all the coastal Provinces, and the Federal Government therefore proposed in December of 1968, to allow coastal Provinces to administer all lands shoreward from mineral resource administrative lines to be drawn off each coast. The Federal Government would concede to the coastal Provinces all revenues derived from the mineral resources of the submerged lands within these lines. It would itself administer offshore mineral rights seaward from the administration lines, but the revenues accruing from these resources would be placed in a single national pool from which half of the revenues would be made available to the provinces concerned.

The Federal proposal would, for greater certainty, draw the administration lines on the basis of the geodetic grid system. They would be so drawn as to enclose for the benefit of the coastal Province the sea bottom on the west between Vancouver Island and the mainland, and on the east large areas beneath the Bay of Fundy, Northumberland Strait, and the Jacques-Cartier Passage, as well as in each case areas adjacent to off-lying islands.

The importance of the problem is indicated by the fact that the continental shelf areas adjacent to Canada have been estimated to be equal to almost 40% of the total land area of Canada, and probably possess substantial mineral resources, particularly oil and gas. Understandably, the Federal proposal has not met with a favourable reaction from the Provinces.

We believe that the orientation of the Federal proposal is the right one: there should be both Federal and Provincial participation in the revenues from these submerged lands, even though the administration should be principally Federal. It is owing to Federal action that there is a Canadian claim to these lands—through, for example, the Canadian participation in the 1958 Conference on the Continental Shelf and the Federal assertion in 1970 of a 12-mile territorial sea. Further expansion of Canadian rights could come about only through further Federal initiatives. It therefore seems fitting that the Federal Government, as the possessor of our international personality and the guardian of our international rights, should have the proprietary right in the seabed.

In addition, Provincial revenues derived from natural resources have been integrated in the equalization formula since 1967. This fact has to be taken into account when considering the question of sharing the revenues associated with offshore mineral rights between the Pro-

vincial and Federal Governments. With respect to the Provincial share of those revenues, it can be said that in most cases, all Provinces will benefit directly or indirectly from any exploitation of offshore minerals in Canada through the equalization formula. Conversely, there will be in most cases an extra cost, in terms of increased equalization grants to Provincial governments, to be absorbed by the Federal Government. Because of this additional cost and because revenues to be derived from offshore mineral rights should be used, to some extent, to reduce regional disparities, we believe that the Federal Government should have its share of those revenues.

But it also seems fitting that the coastal Provinces should have a share in the profits. Such matters have to be determined by man-made criteria rather than by natural principles. Until 1930, when it finally yielded them to the Provinces, the Federal Government had the proprietary rights to minerals in the soil of Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. It was this surrender of title which made Alberta into one of the "have" provinces in Canada, and considerably aided the economy of Saskatchewan. The "have not" Atlantic Provinces might similarly be the beneficiaries of a decision to cede them a substantial share in the profits resulting from offshore resource development.

However, we would not propose a constitutional provision respecting the sharing formula for the profits. We do agree with the Federal proposal that 50% of the profits should go to the Provinces, but we feel strongly that the sharing should be directly between the Federal Government and each coastal Province rather than through a national pool. In other words, we do not think that all the Provinces, or even all the coastal Provinces, should share equally.

As we have mentioned above, some redistribution of those revenues will take place even without a national pool, through the general equalization formula and through the Federal share of the revenues. The coastal Provinces should share in proportion to the revenue derived from that portion of the submerged lands adjacent to their provincial portion. While this would work to the disadvantage of some Province or other from time to time, we feel that it would assure each coastal Province that it was deriving all the revenue that the adjacent resources and a free market could produce.

There is a particular problem with respect to Sable Island, a long sandbar about 150 miles off the coast of Nova Scotia. On the one hand, the British North America Act appears to give the Federal Government both jurisdiction over and proprietary title to the Island. Section 91(9) of the Act specifically mentions it as a head of Federal legislation jurisdiction ("Beacon, Buoys, Lighthouses, and Sable Island") and the Third Schedule to the Act lists it among the provincial public works and property which would become the property of Canada. On the other hand, section 7 of the Act provides that "Nova Scotia . . . shall have the same limits as at the passing of this Act", and there is much evidence both before and after Confederation to suggest that the Island has always been considered part of Nova Scotia. It may be that the best interpretation to be given to the words "Sable Island" in the B.N.A. Act is that they confer Federal title and jurisdiction only to the lighthouse and other aids to navigation on the Island, or at most to the Island's surface.

In the light of Nova Scotia's historic claims to Sable Island, we feel that the Federal Government should relinquish any claim it may have to proprietary rights in the land or mineral rights of Sable Island, and we recommend that in a new Constitution the Island should be recognized as part of the Province of Nova Scotia.

Chapter 25—International Relations

RECOMMENDATIONS

75. Section 132 of the British North America Act should be repealed.
76. The Constitution should make it clear that the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction over foreign policy, the making of treaties, and the exchange of diplomatic and consular representatives.
77. All formal treaties should be ratified by Parliament rather than by the Executive Branch of Government.
78. The Government of Canada should, before binding itself to perform under a treaty an obligation that deals with a matter falling within the legislative competence of the Provinces, consult with the Government of each Province that may be affected by the obligation.
79. The Government of a Province should remain free not to take any action with respect to an obligation undertaken by the Government of Canada under a treaty unless it has agreed to do so.
80. Subject to a veto power in the Government of Canada in the exercise of its exclusive power with respect to foreign policy, the Provincial Governments should have the right to enter into contracts, and administrative, reciprocal and other arrangements with foreign states, or constituent parts of foreign states, to maintain offices abroad for the conduct of Provincial business, and generally to cooperate with the Government of Canada in its international activities.

The conclusion of a treaty is the final step in a series of negotiations between two or more states possessing internationally recognized sovereignty. For a federation the treaty-making power is a manifestation of complex internal relationships which have no parallel in unitary states. In the case of Canada the situation is even more complicated than for many other federal states, because there is no constitutional provision which settles jurisdictional questions. Although the legal question concerning jurisdiction over international relations arose in Canada with the Statute of Westminster in 1931, it became a matter of political importance because of Quebec's recent desire to establish relations abroad especially with French-speaking countries. Until very recently, Canada's international activity and consequent foreign image has almost exclu-

sively reflected its Anglophone side. Quebec's concern, and the new Federal policy of bilingual government, have led to a new emphasis on relations with the Francophone countries and to the projection of a more bilingual international image. But the problems in this general area have not yet been resolved at the legal level.

The prevailing international rule is that there should be a single international personality for all governments, including federations, and that there should be ultimate control by the central government in a federation even if some leeway in international affairs is allowed to the regional governments. Such a single international personality was definitely recognized by the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties in 1969.

In most federal constitutions, the central government is invested with power over international relations. In some constitutions, like that of the U.S.S.R., the regional governments are allowed a certain degree of participation by the constitution, but it is largely fictitious if the internal political structure is taken into account. Other federations, like West Germany, grant regional governments the right to conclude treaties within their jurisdiction, but with certain restrictions. However, this power has tended to become obsolete.

The Canadian Constitution makes no mention whatsoever of treaty-making except in a colonial context. Section 132 of the B.N.A. Act provides that: "The Parliament and Government of Canada shall have all Powers necessary or proper for performing the Obligations of Canada or of any Province thereof, as Part of the British Empire, towards Foreign countries, arising under Treaties between the Empire and such Foreign Countries." Since Canada's participation in the British Empire ended with the Statute of Westminster in 1931, the only formal treaty power in our Constitution is now a spent provision.

The right to sign and ratify treaties has traditionally been regarded in parliamentary government as a prerogative of the executive. However, treaties which require implementation have to be carried out by passing legislation in Parliament. Where the subject matter is one which falls wholly or partly under provincial jurisdiction, Provincial legislation is also necessary for implementation.

Since there has been no constitutional provision for treaty-making in areas of shared jurisdiction, the Federal Government has frequently signed international conventions subject to the reservation that it accepted the con-

vention only to the extent of Federal constitutional jurisdiction. It has also been able in some instances to obtain the consent of the Provincial Governments to ratification, as in the case of the recent International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, though this required five years of Federal-Provincial negotiation. There has also been a serious problem concerning Provincial initiatives in the international arena in commercial and cultural activities, somewhat ameliorated by the willingness of the Federal Government to sign "umbrella treaties" with foreign states which would validate subsequent agreements between that state and a Canadian Province. Such a treaty was worked out with France in 1965 and Quebec and France concluded subsequent cultural agreements. However, this is a piecemeal solution to a general problem.

We recommend that section 132 of the B.N.A. Act should be replaced by provisions incorporating the following principles:

(1) the Federal Government should have exclusive power respecting foreign policy, the making of treaties, and the exchange of diplomatic and consular representatives;

(2) all formal treaties should be ratified by Parliament rather than by the executive Branch of Government;

(3) the Government of Canada should, before binding itself to perform under a treaty an obligation that comes within the legislative competence of the Provinces, consult with the Government of each Province that may be affected by the obligation;

(4) the Government of a Province need not take any action with respect to an obligation undertaken by the Government of Canada under a treaty unless it has agreed to do so;

(5) subject to a veto power by the Government of Canada in the exercise of its exclusive power with respect to foreign policy, the Provincial Governments should have the right to enter into contracts and administrative, reciprocal and other arrangements with foreign states or constituent parts of foreign states, to maintain offices abroad for the conduct of Provincial business, and generally to cooperate with the Government of Canada in its international activities.

PART V—SOCIAL POLICY

Chapter 26—Social Security

RECOMMENDATIONS

81. In the area of social security, there should be a greater decentralization of jurisdiction with a view to giving priority to the Provinces according to recommendations 82, 83 and 84.
82. With respect to social services, the present exclusive jurisdiction of Provincial Legislatures should be retained.
83. With respect to income insurance (including the Quebec and Canada Pension Plans), jurisdiction should be shared according to the present section 94A of the British North America Act, subject to the following exceptions:
 - (1) Workmen's Compensation should be retained under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures;
 - (2) Unemployment Insurance should be retained under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Canadian Parliament.
84. With respect to income support measures:
 - (1) Financial social assistance (Canada Assistance Plan, allowances to the blind, disability allowances, unemployment assistance) should be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures;
 - (2) Veterans' allowances and allowances to Eskimos and Indians living on reserves should continue to be the exclusive responsibility of the Canadian Parliament;
 - (3) Demographic grants (old age pensions, family allowances and youth allowances) and guaranteed income payments (guaranteed income supplement) should be matters of concurrent jurisdiction with limited Provincial paramountcy as to the scale of benefits and the allocation of Federal funds among these income support programs. Thus the Federal Parliament would retain concurrent power to establish programs and to pay benefits to individuals under these programs. However, a Province would have the right to vary the national scheme established by Parliament with respect to the allocation within the Province between the various programs of the total amount determined by the Federal Government and with respect to the

scale of benefits paid to individuals within the Province according to income, number of children, etc., within each program; provided that the benefits paid to individuals under each program should not be less than a certain percentage (perhaps half or two-thirds) of the amounts which would be paid under the scheme proposed by the Federal Government.

For government responsibilities which did not exist in 1867 or which have developed considerably since then, legislative jurisdiction has to be inferred from constitutional provisions which do not deal with them directly. Social security comes under this category. The provisions which are most relevant to this subject are paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of section 92 which give exclusive authority to the Provincial Legislatures over public and reformatory prisons, hospitals, asylums, charities and eleemosynary institutions, as well as municipal institutions, and paragraphs 11 and 28 of section 91 which grant legislative authority to the Canadian Parliament with respect to marine hospitals and penitentiaries.

Since the expression "social security" lends itself to various interpretations, for the purposes of this report we define it as including *social services* (health and welfare services), *income insurance measures* (unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, retirement insurance) and *income support measures* (family and youth allowances, old age security, guaranteed income supplement, financial social assistance, veterans' pensions and allowances).

Several provisions have been added to the original British North America Act in the field of income insurance and income support. A constitutional amendment in 1940 transferred to Parliament exclusive power over unemployment insurance. Then, in 1951, section 94A granted Parliament concurrent legislative power with respect to old age pensions; a 1964 amendment extended this power to cover survivors' and disability benefits irrespective of age. Section 94A now reads as follows: "The Parliament of Canada may make laws in relation to old age pensions and supplementary benefits, including survivors' and disability benefits irrespective of age, but no such law shall affect the operation of any law present or future of a provincial legislature in relation to any such matters."

The Victoria Charter proposed in Article 44 to extend the Federal jurisdiction in section 94A to cover family, youth, and manpower training allowances. In Article 45 it

also proposed the following limitation: "The Government of Canada shall not introduce a bill in the House of Commons in relation to a matter mentioned in section 44 unless it has at least 90 days before such introduction, informed the Government of each Province of the substance of the proposed legislation and requested its views thereon". Article 44 of the Charter corresponds exactly to section 94A of the B.N.A. Act, with the addition of the three subject matters mentioned.

We place particular importance on section 94A and income support problems in general, since this matter has been a cause of disagreement between the Federal Government and the Provinces, especially the Province of Quebec. In fact, it seems that the Quebec Government's refusal to endorse the Victoria Charter stems from its dissatisfaction with Articles 44 and 45.

The provision in section 94A that "no such law shall affect the operation of any law present or future of a provincial legislature in relation to any such matter", is controversial. Was it intended to establish Provincial paramountcy (which would be a constitutional novelty), or to exclude the application of Federal paramountcy? Since this formula was also used in Article 44 of the Victoria Charter, we feel that it would be advisable to restate it in order to avoid ambiguity.

In our view, there should be more decentralization in the field of social security with a view to giving the Provincial Legislatures priority, in accordance with the following specific recommendations.

First, the present exclusive Provincial jurisdiction over social services should be retained.

With respect to income insurance measures (including the Canada and Quebec pension plans), jurisdiction should be shared in accordance with section 94A of the B.N.A. Act, except as follows: workmen's compensation should continue to be the exclusive responsibility of the Provincial Legislatures; unemployment insurance should continue to come under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Canadian Parliament.

With respect to income support measures:

- (1) Financial social assistance (Canada Assistance Plan, allowances for the blind and the disabled, unemployment assistance) should be the exclusive responsibility of the Provincial Legislatures.
- (2) Parliament should continue to have exclusive jurisdiction over veterans' allowances and allowances to Eskimos and Indians living on reserves.
- (3) Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures should enjoy concurrent powers as regards demographic grants (demogrants) such as old age security, family allowances and youth allowances and as to guaranteed income payments (guaranteed income supplement), with limited Provincial paramountcy as to the scale of benefits and the allocation of Federal funds among these income support programs.

More specifically, jurisdiction over demogrants and guaranteed income should be shared in the following way. The total amount spent in the form of demogrants and guaranteed income payments, including family allowances and youth allowances, old age pensions and the

guaranteed income supplement, should be set and financed by the Federal Parliament (without excluding the Provincial Legislatures' power to create and finance their own programs). Benefits to individuals under the different programs (excluding specific programs created and financed by the Provincial Legislatures), should be paid by the Federal Government. The Federal Parliament would be responsible for establishing national standards for each program. However, each Provincial Legislature would be free to modify the Federal program as regards the distribution of the total amount set by the Federal Parliament for the various programs and as regards the scale of benefits paid to individuals according to income, number of children, etc., for each program. In each Province, the benefits paid to individuals under each program might not fall below a certain percentage (perhaps half or two thirds) of the benefits paid in accordance with the national standards in the program established by the Federal Parliament. The total amount determined by the Federal Parliament would be distributed among the Provinces according to the amount each Province would receive if the Federal program were applied in all Provinces.

As a result of this recommendation, the Federal Parliament would determine the total amounts to be paid for family allowances, old age pensions, including old age supplements, and youth allowances. However, it would be up to the Provincial Governments to decide how this total amount would be distributed among the different programs and to set the scale of benefits under each program. It is our belief that this recommendation meets most of the arguments put forth by the Federal and Provincial Governments.

In determining the total amount paid to the Provinces for these four income support programs, the Federal Parliament could make an even more extensive redistribution of income than now, since the distribution and financing of benefits to individuals under the four programs would continue to be the responsibility of the Federal Parliament.

Our recommendation would make for a redistribution of income better suited to the needs and characteristics of each Province, while allowing the Provincial Legislatures to determine the portion of the total amount which would be allocated to each program. The Provincial Governments could even agree on a formula which would, in their opinion, be best suited to each program. It is quite conceivable, for example, that the family allowance benefit paid for the first child would be different from the benefits paid for the second, third or fourth child. Similarly, Provincial Legislatures would be free to have old age pensions vary according to the recipient's income.

Since according to our proposal the Federal Government would continue to collect taxes from all Canadians and to send cheques to people throughout the Country, Canadians would still be reminded of the *raison d'être* of this redistribution—what the Federal Government calls a "feeling of Canadian unity which is both the cause of the redistribution of income between Canada's people and regions and the result of such a measure."

We feel that it is very important to be able to transfer payments easily to individuals who move from one Province to another. Such transferability, however, need not imply equality of payments. But the assurance must be

given that a person will not be deprived, even briefly, of such a payment because he has just moved. Payments are easily transferable when it is the Federal Government that sends out the cheques to individuals everywhere in Canada.

Our proposal implies that the Federal Government would keep control over the tax fields used to finance income support programs, and determine the total cost of these different programs. It would maintain the Federal Government's power to implement an effective economic policy. This is so because it is less important for the Federal Government to decide who will receive what than to determine the total amount paid for all programs and to keep control over tax fields which serve to finance these programs. Therefore, our proposal adds to the flexibility of the Provincial Governments with respect to these programs and yet maintains the Federal Government's power to influence the economy.

The Quebec Government has stressed the integration of the different programs with regard to income security and the importance of adapting each program to the characteristics of the regional, economic and demographic structures of the Province. We feel that our proposal meets this view to a large extent. We also meet another argument of the Quebec Government according to which "all the social security measures are in direct relation to the culture of a people and allow it to express itself as an entity." It is our belief that as far as demogrants and guaranteed income are concerned, the total amount paid is relatively less important to Provinces than its allocation and the social choices this involves. Furthermore, our recommendation would allow a Provincial Government to create and finance a given program which will meet specific needs.

For these reasons we believe that the comprehensiveness of our proposals is consistent both with principle and with the needs of the country as a whole.

Chapter 27 — Criminal Law

RECOMMENDATIONS

85. Since we believe that each Province should be able to regulate the conduct of its own people in such matters as the operation of motor vehicles, Sunday observance, betting, and lotteries, the Federal Parliament should have the right to delegate even to a single Province legislative jurisdiction over any part of the criminal law.

86. Because there is some ambiguity resulting from current practice, if not from the Constitution, the Federal power over the administration of criminal justice should be made clear so that the Federal Parliament would be seen to have clear and undoubted jurisdiction to enforce its own laws in the criminal field.

Because of the limitations which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council placed upon the General Power and the Trade and Commerce Power, the Criminal Law Power in section 91(27) has turned out to be one of the most comprehensive powers possessed by the Federal Government. However, while this power is stated to be exclusively Federal, the Provinces are given jurisdiction by section 92(15) over "The Imposition of Punishment by Fine, Penalty, or Imprisonment for enforcing any Law of the Province made in relation to any Matter coming within any of the Classes of Subjects enumerated in this section", coupled with jurisdiction over provincial prisons (section 92(6)) and over the administration of justice in the Province (section 92(14)).

What this amounts to in fact is that there is a concurrent jurisdiction over criminal law, the Provincial power being narrower and subject to Federal paramountcy in cases of unresolvable conflict. This concurrency is nowhere more evident than in a series of recent Supreme Court of Canada decisions (*O'Grady v. Sparling*, [1960] S.C.R. 804; *Mann v. The Queen*, [1966] S.C.R. 238; *R. v. Binus*, [1967] S.C.R. 594; and *R. v. Peda*, [1969] S.C.R. 905). In order to uphold Provincial jurisdiction over the offence of careless driving in the face of the Federal offence of dangerous driving, the Court finally felt forced to establish overly refined degrees of advertence within the *mens rea* (guilty mind) necessary for conviction. We do not disapprove of the result of these cases, but we do believe that they leave very little reason for maintaining the fiction that criminal law is an area of exclusive Federal jurisdiction. We have therefore had to face the question whether the Constitution should explicitly recognize the concurrent Provincial power over criminal law which we believe actually exists.

We believe there is an even better reason for a Provincial role in the criminal law area than the clarification of concepts and the improved resolution of conflicts. The criminal law is, after all, an expression of the moral views and the mores of a people, and it is obvious that the views of Canadians in matters of behaviour differ considerably across the country, and often markedly from Province to Province. In the United States this is recognized by locating the criminal law power principally in the state governments with a merely supplementary power in the federal government. We see no need for so radical a change in Canadian federalism, but we can also see no reason why each Province should not be able to regulate the conduct of its own people in matters such as the laws relating to the operation of motor vehicles, lotteries, betting, and Sunday observance. For instance, Ontario would like greater latitude with respect to off-track betting, Quebec with respect to lotteries and gaming generally. To some extent Provincial option is now provided for by Federal law, but on a piecemeal and limited basis. We favour greater freedom for the Provinces to control the behaviour of their people, and to experiment on a province-wide scale.

Since the matters over which we would like to see provincial jurisdiction fall largely into what we think of as the regulatory area, we gave some consideration to recommending Provincial jurisdiction over *mala prohibita* (things which are evil mainly because prohibited), while retaining an exclusive Federal power over *mala in se* (things which are evil in themselves). The distinction between the two categories, however, is not always clear within the criminal law. In addition, often what causes social conflict is the very question of classification. For instance, some regard gambling as at worst a *malum prohibitum*, whereas to others it is a *malum in se*. Moreover, such a distinction would preclude even the possibility of Provincial jurisdiction in the area of *mala in se*.

We have therefore decided to recommend, in this one area, a power of delegation from the Federal to the Provincial Legislatures. We believe it should be exercisable at the option of a single Province, subject to the concurrence of Parliament. Obviously, Parliament would not delegate a power to one Province which it was not prepared to delegate to others, but one Province might wish to institute, for example, government-controlled off-track betting, while other Provinces might have no interest whatsoever in obtaining such a power. We assume that Parliament would not delegate to one Province jurisdic-

tion over matters like the use of marijuana which might then embarrass the other Provinces and the Federal Government because of smuggling across provincial borders. Naturally we hope that the Provinces would be prepared to establish uniform legislation in those parts of delegated fields where uniformity may be of importance. But we believe that the delegation of many subjects within the criminal law power to the Provinces would be beneficial in allowing people to have criminal legislation which more closely reflected the consensus in their part of the country as to socially tolerable behaviour. We see this as a gain for democracy, and in line with our other recommendations for fuller Provincial control over the quality and style of life.

There is one matter within the area of criminal justice where we believe Federal jurisdiction should be more clearly delineated and exercised. We refer to the administration of criminal justice. Section 91(27) gives jurisdiction

to the Federal Government over "The Criminal Law, except the Constitution of Courts of Criminal Jurisdiction, but including the Procedure in Criminal Matters". Section 92(14), on the other hand, provides for Provincial jurisdiction over "The Administration of Justice in the Province, including the Constitution, Maintenance, and Organization of Provincial Courts, both of Civil and of Criminal Jurisdiction, and including Procedure in Civil Matters in those Courts." The existing Federal power over procedure in criminal matters is probably wide enough to establish complete Federal control in all prosecutions under criminal legislation, and the Federal Government takes the position that the largely Provincial administration now existing in this area is a matter of Federal tolerance, not a constitutional right. We believe it would be desirable to have a clear constitutional solution, and that the Federal Parliament ought to have jurisdiction with respect to the enforcement of its own laws.

Chapter 28—Marriage and Divorce

RECOMMENDATIONS

87. In keeping with our principle of control by the Provinces of their social destiny, the jurisdiction over "Marriage and Divorce" should be transferred to the Provincial Legislatures, subject to an agreed common definition of domicile.

There are very few areas of the law which come more directly or more intimately in contact with the lives of the average citizens of a country than the law relating to marriage and divorce. Under section 91(26) the legislative power over "Marriage and Divorce" is an enumerated power given to the Parliament of Canada. In addition, the British North America Act also grants the exclusive authority to make laws in relation to "The Solemnization of Marriage in the Province" to the Provinces under section 92(12). The interpretation of these respective heads of Federal and Provincial power has been argued in the courts on a number of occasions.

One of the issues argued has been: does the provincial power over solemnization extend only to the regulation of the formalities by which the contract of marriage is to be authenticated or can it also affect in any way the validity of the marriage itself? In *Re Marriage Legislation in Canada* [1912] A.C. 880, Viscount Haldane, L.C. said on this issue that the "jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament does not, on the true construction of ss. 91 and 92, cover the whole field of validity." The Privy Council considered that section 92(12) operated "by way of exception to the powers conferred as regards marriage by s. 91, and enables the provincial Legislature to enact conditions as to solemnization which may affect the validity of the contract". Viscount Haldane later said:

Prima facie these words appear to their Lordships to import that the whole of what solemnization ordinarily meant in the systems of law of the provinces of Canada at the time of confederation is intended to come within them including conditions which affect validity.

As an example of the application of Viscount Haldane's principle, it was decided in *Kerr v. Kerr et Al.*, [1934] S.C.R. 72, that there was no doubt that, in the exercise of its jurisdiction under section 92(12), the Legislature of a Province may lawfully prescribe the consent of the parents or guardian to the marriage of a minor, as an essential element in the ceremony of marriage itself. As Chief Justice Duff said:

Nor have I any doubt that by s. 17(1) [of the Ontario Marriage Act] the consents required are prescribed as elements in the ceremony. These requirements apply to all marriages celebrated in Ontario, and to no marriages but those celebrated in Ontario, whether the parties to the marriage be domiciled in Ontario or elsewhere. The legislature is, I think, dealing with the solemnities of marriage and not with the capacities of the parties.

Chief Justice Duff said later in his judgment:

The authority of the provinces, therefore, extends not only to prescribing such formalities as properly fall within the matters designated by "Solemnization of Marriage", they have the power to enforce the rules laid down by penalty, by attaching the consequence of invalidity and by attaching such consequences absolutely or conditionally. It is within the power of a province to say that a given requirement shall be absolute in marriages. This, of course, is always subject to the observation that a province cannot under the form of dealing with the "solemnization of marriage", enact legislation which, in substance, relates to some part of the subject of "marriage", which is not reserved to the provinces as a subject of legislative jurisdiction.

As Mr. Justice Lamont said in the same case:

The provincial legislature is, therefore, competent by apt legislation to make the preliminaries, leading up to the marriage ceremony, conditions precedent to the solemnization of the marriage. From this it follows, in my opinion, that the legislature is also competent to declare that in the event of these conditions precedent not being complied with no valid marriage has taken place.

Provincial Legislatures have considerable authority at the moment to deal with many aspects of family law in Canada. Professor Bora Laskin, as he then was, points out:

Legislative power to deal with the substantive law of alimony has been held to belong to the Provinces.... So, too, legislative power in relation to maintenance.... Equally, it is within provincial legislative power to deal with the protection of children and with their custody and support, or the support of spouses inter se... (Laskin, *Canadian Constitutional Law*, 3rd edition, 1028)

The Divorce Act (Canada) 1968 provides for certain auxiliary relief in an action for divorce including alimony, and maintenance for a spouse and children of a marriage.

Throughout the world social attitudes vary widely on marriage and divorce. Some societies view marriage almost exclusively as a religious ceremony in which the state has only a marginal interest; others treat marriage as purely a social contract in which the state may or may not have a substantial interest. There are different religious, ethical and social views of marriage and divorce in Canada, and particularly of divorce, but, of course, the variations are within much narrower limits. Yet there certainly have been important differences (although perhaps relatively fewer now) between regions in Canada. By having the legislative power over "Marriage and Divorce" a Federal power under section 91(26), it has been argued that this makes divorce law less responsive to change. It is argued that the law is framed to meet the objections of those groups which are least amenable to change—that the tail wags the dog, so to speak. On the other hand, if the legislative power were to be transferred to the Provinces it is likely that the laws would conform more closely to the social and ethical values of the Canadians living in that Province, and be a more genuine and particular expression of their social philosophy. There does not appear to be any real merit in the argument that Canada ought to have any "national standard" with respect to divorce.

It is true that almost all Canadians abhor marriage breakup and its attendant family and social problems. But in this area the law is largely a procedural device for ameliorating the effects of a situation which has developed for extra-legal reasons. The substantive law of divorce results in remedies to those in its jurisdiction who have already decided that their marriage is dead. The relative degree of ease in obtaining a divorce induces very few to leave any real marriage—so long as the law does not countenance the completely frivolous causes of action. It does not imply that any jurisdiction views marriage

with any less sanctity, or that a particular jurisdiction hoped any less at the outset of the marriage that it would succeed. The transfer of jurisdiction over divorce means that, if a marriage has failed, one jurisdiction may choose to grant relief for reasons emanating from its particular social philosophy, whereas another, with a differing philosophy, may choose not to give relief. The reason for the difference may be readily understood. The fact, however, that one Canadian living in a particular province might get a divorce where another might not should not offend anyone deeply. (For many years, prior to the Divorce Act (Canada) 1968, Nova Scotians could get a divorce on the basis of cruelty while other Canadians could not.) We accept this phenomenon in the rest of the world as a condition of pluralism. We ought to be able to do the same for our fellow countrymen.

In view of the general principle supported in this Report that, broadly speaking, social policy ought to be within Provincial jurisdiction where possible, we believe that a transfer of jurisdiction over "marriage and divorce" is desirable. This would allow for a more integrated approach to family law within Provincial jurisdictions. It would also allow for a more integrated family law approach within the two legal systems in the country, the civil and common law systems.

Of course, in the event such a transfer of jurisdiction to the Provinces were to occur, certain protections would be required for Canadians, especially an agreed common definition of domicile. It would be more than unseemly if a Canadian citizen were married in the eyes of one Province and not in another! But we are confident that many problems which might grow out of our recommendation can be met within the developing framework of our present law. The values to be achieved by the transfer of jurisdiction, through making the law of divorce more relevant to the community in which it will be applied and of which it, we hope, will be an expression, are worth some inconvenience in the inter-jurisdictional recognition of divorce decrees.

Chapter 29—Education

RECOMMENDATIONS

88. Education as such should remain an exclusively Provincial power as at present, subject to the guarantees for minorities set out elsewhere in this Report.
89. The Provinces should create a permanent office for cooperation and coordination in education, and Federal participation should be confined to the area of Federal jurisdiction over the education of native peoples, immigrants, and defence personnel and dependents.

If it is recognized that people are the greatest resource of Canada, then it follows that Canadians should have equal opportunity regardless of what part of a province or what region they live in. We apply the same principle to education. Since it moulds the lives of the citizens as well as in a sense the future of the country, it is of prime concern to the government and to the citizens. Canada is basically a bilingual and multicultural country, and this fact should be appropriately reflected in her educational policies.

Under the provisions of the British North America Act, and subject to section 93 as well as the corresponding legislation concerning Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and the 1949 Amendment regarding Newfoundland, education comes under the jurisdiction of the Provinces. Since the passing of the Act, great changes have taken place in the character of the population and in economic, technological and social conditions, which have produced a progressive, affluent, urban-oriented society. Consequently the Federal Government has had to assume an indirect and limited role in education.

Many witnesses favoured a definite role in education for the Federal Government. Many others, particularly in

Quebec, favoured the retention of, or return to, full Provincial jurisdiction in education, and opposed any interference by Federal authorities. The majority, however, supported the idea that, under a federal system, and mainly for reasons of mobility, more coordination should be developed between various Provincial programs. Most of them suggested that a mechanism be provided for the coordination and cooperation of the Provinces in general educational policies; they also favoured the working out of a formula which, without affecting the jurisdiction of the Provinces in this field, would be in their best interest as well as that of the country as a whole.

After carefully considering all the views that were expressed across the country and fully respecting the concern of the Provinces, especially Quebec, the Committee has come to the conclusion that education as such should remain an exclusively Provincial power as at present under section 93 of the B.N.A. Act. Despite the undoubted value of a subordinate Federal role in education, especially in promoting bilingualism, we feel that it would be preferable for the Federal Parliament to pursue its legitimate goals in education, culture and research through existing Federal powers, like the spending power, rather than through a direct, even though subordinate, power in the field of education.

We hope that the Provincial Governments will continue to meet at the ministerial level to discuss cooperation and coordination and that these meetings will be put on a more permanent basis. In our view it would be highly desirable if the Provinces created a permanent national office for cooperation and coordination. The Federal Government could have a subordinate participation confined to the extent of its constitutional jurisdiction in the educational field as regards native peoples as well as through the departments of Defence and Immigration.

Chapter 30—Communications

RECOMMENDATIONS

90. The Parliament of Canada should retain exclusive jurisdiction over the means in broadcasting and other systems of communication.
91. The Provinces should have exclusive jurisdiction over the program content in provincial educational broadcasting, whatever means of communication is employed.

The question of communications in its contemporary sense was not a large one for the Fathers of Confederation, since in 1867 "communications" meant mainly "transport", except for the newly-born telegraphic system. Thus the British North America Act deals with this subject only in section 92(10)(a) and (b), where it establishes Federal jurisdiction for "Lines of Steam or other Ships, Railways, Canals, Telegraphs and other Works and Undertakings connecting the Province with any other or others of the Provinces, or extending beyond the Limits of the Province" and "Lines of Steam Ships between the Province and any British or Foreign Country". Telephones as we know them, let alone radio, television and satellites, were hardly imaginable then. Our discussion in this chapter relates only to communications and does not include transportation.

In 1932 the Privy Council, relying in large part on the Federal General Power, held the regulation and control of radio communications to be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament. Since that time Parliament has regulated radio, and subsequently television, broadcasting.

The Province of Quebec, which has always jealously claimed and preserved its exclusive jurisdiction in the field of education under section 93 of the B.N.A. Act, early claimed an extension of that jurisdiction to the field of communications, and in 1945 passed its own Broadcasting Act authorizing the creation of a Provincial broadcasting system. In the face, however, of the refusal of the Federal Government to issue a broadcasting licence to Provinces or corporations owned by them, the Quebec Government proceeded no further, though the Act was not repealed.

While the desirability of Federal jurisdiction was reaffirmed in 1957 by the Report of the Fowler Royal Commission on Broadcasting, an Advisory Committee to the Secretary of State recommended in 1965 that "licences should in future be granted to educational institutions or corporations, even if they are wholly or partly owned by

the provincial Governments. . . ." (*Report of the Committee on Broadcasting*, 1965, p. 278). In 1966 the Federal Government announced in a White Paper on Broadcasting that it was prepared to enter into agreements with any Province to make public service facilities available, and the Broadcasting Act of 1968 set out that position in these words: "facilities should be provided within the Canadian Broadcasting System for educational broadcasting" (section 3(i)).

Consequently from 1932 to the 1968 Federal Broadcasting Act we can detect some evolution from exclusive Federal control of the field of communications to an acceptance by the Federal Government that Provinces might share Federal facilities in the field of educational broadcasting. Moreover, in 1968 the province of Quebec revived the 1945 Broadcasting Act creating Radio-Quebec. The position of Quebec was clearly stated in the brief presented by its Government at the Constitutional Conference in Ottawa in February 1968:

Another area to which the Quebec Government attaches the utmost importance concerns media for the dissemination of education and culture, particularly radio and television. As things now stand, the provinces are a long way from playing the part that should normally be theirs in this field. Since frequencies are controlled by Ottawa, allocation of radio and television stations within Quebec boundaries was made without our Government being given the slightest voice in the matter. This situation results from the interpretation given by the Courts to our constitution, and is unacceptable to Quebec.

The changes required in this area will have to take into account the various components of broadcasting; we refer particularly to such organizations as the Board of Broadcast Governors and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Airwaves are rightfully considered to be in the public domain; they cannot and must not be the federal government's appanage. Just as program content, allocation of frequencies can have serious repercussions at the cultural level. Quebec cannot tolerate any longer being kept outside a field where her vital interest is so obvious, especially in view of the potential impact of audio-visual means of mass communication in educating both children and adults. (Government of Quebec, *Brief on the Constitution* presented to the Constitutional Conference, February 5-7, 1968, pp. 15-16).

In 1969, Quebec introduced the Quebec Broadcasting Bureau Act to update the 1945 Act. Although the Bureau was granted wide powers, programs produced by it were required still to be transmitted by Federally licensed stations. Following this legislation the Federal Government cancelled its plans to establish a Federal Educational Broadcasting Agency, and moved towards the recognition of a Provincial role in educational television.

The principal constitutional problem has not been provincial rights in the field of education as such, but rather what type of broadcasting constitutes education. Ontario and Alberta were as interested as Quebec in arriving at a solution, and in 1969 the Secretary of State and the Council of Ministers of Education worked out a definition acceptable to all for purposes of implementing the new policy. Professor Ronald Atkey has commented:

The new definition appears to be more in accord with the provinces' exclusive constitutional jurisdiction in the field of education . . .

Related to the definition and financial matters (above) is the question whether the "broadcasting framework" provided by the Federal Government for educational broadcasting is indeed a viable one within which each of the provinces can effectively carry out its constitutional responsibilities. ("The Provincial Interest in Broadcasting under The Canadian Constitution", *Ontario Advisory Committee on Confederation*, 1970, Volume 2, pages 228-229).

Under this new arrangement Alberta and Ontario have already set up their own extensive systems of educational television.

In the meantime another development has occurred—broadcasting by satellite. The Federal Government has been actively involved in a satellite program in the past few years. Faced with this important technical advance and limited by its own financial means, the Province of Quebec has been involved in talks with France on the question of sharing the French satellite system which is itself based on a Franco-German satellite project agreement.

We recommend that the Provinces should have exclusive control over program content in Provincial educational broadcasting, and that this principle should be carried through from radio to television to telephones to satellites and to any new invention in the same field. In other words we recognize that, as an extension of their exclusive rights in the field of education, the Provinces are solely responsible for the content of Provincial educational programs distributed through any means of communication.

On the other hand we also recommend that the Federal Government should retain its sole jurisdiction over the means in broadcasting and other systems of communications. We propose no change in the Federal Government's general jurisdiction over broadcasting.

PART VI—THE REGULATION OF THE ECONOMY

Chapter 31—Economic Policy

RECOMMENDATIONS

92. The Federal Parliament and Government should retain the primary responsibility for general economic policy designed to achieve national economic goals. This means that they must have sufficient economic powers to regulate the economy through structural, monetary and fiscal policies.
93. National economic policies should take more account of regional objectives through coordinating mechanisms between governments and through considerable administrative decentralization in the operation of the Federal Government and its agencies.
94. Provincial and municipal governments should also take more account of national economic objectives.

The economic policy of Canada must operate in a particularly difficult context. First, the fact is that our economy is very open. Since more than a quarter of the total demand in Canada hinges on external factors, it is very important for the Federal Government to be equipped with anticyclical policy instruments which are efficient, yet flexible enough to cope with sudden economic changes. This sensitivity to economic decisions made by other countries was clearly shown on August 15, 1971, when the United States imposed a 10% surtax on imports. Then, too, the fact that our regional economic structures vary across Canada means that national anticyclical policies cannot perfectly fit all regions at the same time. Each region has its own people, often its special institutions, its own climate, its own geography, and, generally its own needs and costs for public and private goods. Each region has its own conception of economic development. The existence of these regional imperatives makes it more difficult to work out a national policy.

Finally, Canada as a federal state, with various levels of government, has certain built-in delays to Federal intervention in the economic field in the interests of consultation. The existence of independent regional administrations also implies that the economic policy of the Federal Government may be thwarted by those administrations. This is a particularly significant problem for the management of the economy in that nearly half the public sector falls under regional administrations. Despite these difficulties the need for a coordinated economic policy involving both the Federal and the Provincial levels of Government is obvious. We shall deal with their respec-

tive roles later, after dealing with the more fundamental problem which we now discuss.

For many witnesses who appeared before our Committee, the only logical solution to the difficulties we have outlined was centralization. Thus, one expert felt that Canada must be recentralized to become economically efficient:

Finally, with respect to stabilization policies, the greater the degree of decentralization the more hopeless the situation becomes. In this specific case, I would like to point out an experience that is one, to my mind, of the more ravaging that exists in Canada and that has to do with public investment. Most public investment in Canada is done by 10, 12 or 14 agencies at the very most, say, at the federal level, the Department of Transport and the CNR, two or three education departments because of school buildings in Canada, two or maybe three highway departments, three major hydroelectric companies, the City of Montreal, the City of Toronto, the City of Vancouver and the City of Winnipeg. In other words, there are 12 or 14 major public agencies that account for most of public investment in the country.

These agencies are, by and large, autonomous with respect to borrowing and in the case of several of them, autonomous with respect to fiscal resources with the result that they do exactly what they want. These agencies have never met to my knowledge for the last 10 years with respect to a public investment program in this country. Furthermore, they have never felt the necessity to do so with the result that the federal government that wants to achieve responsibilities with respect to anticyclical policies must compensate for completely irrational policies of some of these agencies, irrational in the terms of what is required by the economic situation. In that sense I would like to recall the period of 1955 to 1957 when inflationary pressures were fanned by half a dozen of these major corporations with the result that when the recession started in 1957 there was nothing left on the shelf as far as public investment was concerned. We asked, then, the federal government to compensate for a gigantic hole in public investment that, of course, could not be compensated for because everything had been spent in the previous two years.

In that sense there is no doubt at all in my mind that Canada must be recentralized to be economically effi-

cient both with respect to growth and anticyclical policies. It does not have to be done through an overhauling of the Constitution. The Constitution as it exists now allows for this quite easily. I recognize that in the United States over the last six months or so there has been a tendency away from centralization. In other words, the recent Nixon program allows for some unconditional transfers to the states and their municipalities. I would like to suggest, however, that this is entirely new in the United States. If I understand Mr. Nixon properly or his program what is implied here is an attempt to put a little flexibility in a system where there has never been any and where, in fact, the whole thing had become exceedingly centralized. In Canada it is probably the other way around. It is probably the opposite policy that has to be followed: in other words, a very definite attempt to recentralize Canada. (3.44:11).

For another witness this economic efficiency could be reached by cooperation rather than by centralization:

The solution to this incoherence does not reside necessarily in the centralization of powers as Mr. Parizeau has concluded, who is ready to sacrifice the flexibility of decentralization in favour of a political efficiency that he illustrates by pointing to us the example of the United States. No. In West Germany at the time of the budget preparation there is a tripartite official cooperation between the federal government, the states and the municipalities for the purpose of harmonizing the economic and financial policies in relation to the needs of the various levels of government. Cooperation is the introduction of coherence in a decentralized society. It alone allows at the same time flexibility and efficiency. Therefore it is not a question of knowing which of the various levels of government will have the last word; it means ensuring, on the one part, that the division of responsibility corresponds to the real nature of the problems which are total and non-sectorial and, on the other hand, to ensure that the various levels of decision are coherent in their action.

The fundamental constitutional problem, in the long run, is therefore to institutionalize this cooperation. (3.57:15)

The members of this Committee believe that the cost of centralization would be much too high in Canada. We believe also that real economic efficiency cannot be reached without taking into account both the regional and the national interest. It is possible, moreover, to reconcile the efficiency of a national policy and the flexibility of a regionalization of this policy. Given the Canadian reality, the interdependence of governmental activities and the diversity of economic structures in Canadian regions, we can only conclude that efficiency must imply cooperation between governments.

This interpenetration of governmental operations is a reality of life in Canada. Thus such local activities as municipal borrowing (especially from foreign sources) may sometimes frustrate national policies. Again, certain national policies, like credit restriction by the Bank of Canada, may not be adapted to the economic conditions of certain areas. At the local and national levels, therefore, efficiency must take into account both national and regional objectives. The same arguments which in the

political field led Canada to adopt a federal and not a unitary system require flexibility and coordination in matters of economic policy.

We do not, however, question the fact that the Federal Parliament should retain the primary responsibility for general economic policy in the country. It is axiomatic that the Federal Parliament and the Federal Government are the only bodies which can effectively act for the whole country, taking into account international and interprovincial factors. Consequently prime responsibility for the achievement of our national economic goals must fall under these institutions and their general economic mandate. This means that the Federal Parliament must have sufficient economic powers (1) in terms of the structural regulation of the economy, for example, over securities, financial institutions, interprovincial trade, etc., and (2) in terms of its overall influence on the economy through its monetary policy and through its aggregate expenditures and taxes.

Consequently, when there is a need to regulate the structure of the economy for national economic purposes, we generally recommend a Federal power, either exclusive or paramount. For the same reasons, we think that monetary policies should remain a Federal responsibility. In terms of powers, this constitutes a large degree of centralization. We feel, however, that through considerable administrative decentralization in the operation of the Federal Government and its agencies, Federal policies in those fields can be regionally adapted.

We have already expressed the view that decentralization of decision-making has a certain value in itself in a country as vast and as diverse as Canada. Most Crown Corporations could have their headquarters outside Ottawa, as many already are. Federal departments like Agriculture, Energy, Mines and Resources, Environment, National Defence and Transport could have their principal offices elsewhere, and many other departments could give their regional offices more authority. Even when Ottawa must remain the effective centre of administration, a greater effort can be made to encourage regional input.

Obviously not all economic policies can be selective. Thus monetary policy can hardly vary between regions because of the mobility of capital. Even in the United States, where there are twelve Federal Reserve Banks, credit conditions always follow similar patterns. That is not saying, however, that monetary policy can disregard regional factors altogether. When it appears that a particular monetary policy which is justified for national reasons is hardly, or not at all, suited to one or several regions, it becomes important to compensate for the inequitable side-effects through other anticyclical instruments, such as Federal expenditures, which can be easily made selective. Another way the Federal Government can offset the harmful regional effects of these national policies would be to facilitate public borrowing by regional governments where necessary. This type of selective policy seems to us essential in Canadian federalism. But economic powers are also present, though indirectly, in every expenditure made and every tax levied by government. With respect to this overall influence it is clear that the Federal Government must be able to have a decisive effect on the economy through its aggregate expenditures.

We do not think that this objective necessarily implies a control on all aspects of these expenditures. Our recommendations relating to the spending power of Parliament and to many programs in the field of social security are such that they allow aggregate Federal control over the amounts which are spent while giving much flexibility to the Provincial Legislatures in the determination of the nature of these expenditures. Consequently, where the objective is to regulate the structure of the business climate for national purposes, we would give the Federal institutions the powers they need. But where the purpose of the expenditure is largely social or broadly cultural we would let the Provinces establish priorities, reserving to the Federal authority sufficient economic leverage, in aggregate terms, to carry out its prime responsibilities in the fiscal field.

But the success or failure of anticyclical policies in Canada depends in large part, on the efficiency of our intergovernmental mechanisms of consultation and coordination. One condition for the realization of a coordinated and flexible economic policy is for the main public bodies in Canada to meet periodically. Another condition is that those public bodies be able to work together efficiently. We have made recommendations above towards augmenting the prestige and influence of Federal-Provincial conferences. With regard to the economic policy more particularly, we think that nonpolitical bodies such as the Bank of Canada and the Economic Council of Canada should be more directly involved in these conferences. Their contribution would certainly increase the efficiency and the prestige of the group and very likely the quality of the decisions taken.

Chapter 32—Trade and Commerce

RECOMMENDATION

- 95. Parliament should have exclusive jurisdiction over international and interprovincial trade and commerce, including the instrumentalities of such trade and commerce. Intraprovincial trade and commerce should remain under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures.**

"Regulation of Trade and Commerce" is a power conferred on the Parliament of Canada by section 91(2) of the British North America Act. Language of such breadth might appear to give Parliament control over the whole field of trade and commerce, but the Privy Council early came to the conclusion that the words could not be read as having their ordinary meaning. As it was put by Lord Hobhouse in the case of *The Bank of Toronto v. Lambe*:

... it has been found absolutely necessary that the literal meaning of the words should be restricted, in order to afford scope for powers which are given exclusively to the provincial legislatures. ([1887], 12 App. Cas. 575, at p. 586).

For one thing no distinction was made between "trade" and "commerce", so that their conjunction did not extend their individual meaning. This was stated by Mr. Justice Henry in *Citizens Insurance Co. v. Parsons*:

'Trade' means the act or business of exchanging commodities by barter, or the business of buying and selling for money—commerce—traffic—barter; it means the giving of one article for another for money or money's worth. 'Commerce' is only another term for the same thing. ([1880], 4 S.C.R. 215 at 287).

Moreover, the power to regulate was held not to include the power to prohibit, since 'regulation' implies the conservation of the thing to be made the subject of regulations. Lord Davey put it this way in *Municipal Corporation of the City of Toronto v. Virgo*:

... their Lordships think there is a marked distinction to be drawn between the prohibition or prevention of a trade and the regulation of governance of it, and indeed a power to regulate and govern seems to imply the continued existence of that which is to be regulated or governed. ([1896] A.C. 88, at p. 93).

Further in the 1881 case of *Citizens Insurance Co. v. Parsons* ([1881], 7 App. Cas. 96 at p. 112), Sir Montague Smith made it clear for the Privy Council that section

91(2) could confer jurisdiction on Parliament only over international trade arrangements, matters of interprovincial concern, and what he called "general trade and commerce", which appeared to be limited to the general regulation of federally incorporated companies. This might have been a solid basis for Federal jurisdiction, but in the ensuing years the trade and commerce power was further eroded to the point where Lord Haldane could suggest that it was a merely "ancillary" power:

It is, in their Lordships' opinion, now clear that, excepting so far as the power can be invoked in aid of capacity conferred independently under other words in s. 91, the power to regulate trade and commerce cannot be relied on as enabling the Dominion Parliament to regulate civil rights in the Provinces. (*Toronto Electric Commissioners v. Snider*, [1925] A.C. 396, at p. 409).

This dictum was later expressly repudiated by Lord Atkin in a 1931 case, (*Proprietary Articles Trade Association v. Attorney General of Canada* [1931] A.C. 310, at p. 326) but it indicates the low estate to which section 91(2) had fallen.

The judicial fate of the trade and commerce power stands in stark contrast to the judicial extension of the American commerce clause which reads:

The Congress shall have Power . . . to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; (Article 1, Section 8).

So broadly has the U.S. Supreme Court been willing to push the limits of this power that Mr. Justice Murphy was able to declare that "the federal commerce power is as broad as the economic needs of the nation." (*American Power & Light Co. v. Securities & Exchange Commission*, [1946], 329 U.S. 90, at p. 104.)

The Commonwealth Parliament in Australia is given jurisdiction by section 5 (i) of the Constitution over "trade and commerce with other countries, and among the States", and legislation of the Commonwealth is given paramountcy over State legislation. This appeals to us as a reasonable statement of Federal power, and we recommend it for Canada. We believe that Parliament should be able to regulate a product where the principal market is outside of the province of production or where trade is carried on throughout the country by transactions that ignore provincial boundaries, and of course with respect to all aspects of international trade. While it is possible that the Courts will hold such jurisdiction to belong to

Parliament even under the present Constitution, the matter is too central to Federal control over the economy to leave to chance.

The Federal power should also include jurisdiction over the instrumentalities of national and international trade and commerce. For example, under the present Constitution Parliament has had to designate grain elevators, mills and feed warehouses "Works . . . for the general Advantage of Canada" under sections 91(29) and 92(10)(c) in

order to gain a satisfactory measure of control over the grain trade. It might be desirable if an open-ended power such as that in section 92(10)(c) (of declaring any work to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more provinces) were eliminated from the Constitution, and more narrowly drawn powers (e.g., over transportation and communication) made available to the Federal Parliament. But in any event Parliament should have adequate power to control the instrumentalities of trade and commerce.

Chapter 33—Income Controls

RECOMMENDATION

96. In cases of national emergency, as defined by the Parliament of Canada, the Provinces should delegate to the Federal Parliament all additional powers necessary to control prices, wages and other forms of income, including rent, dividends and profits, to implement its prime responsibility for full employment and balanced economic growth.

One of the themes which constantly recurred in the evidence we heard was a concern across the whole of Canada about inflation. Without entering into a debate about its economic causes, we would conclude that Canadians wish to place in the hands of their governments effective jurisdictional tools to tackle the problem. To a large extent they would probably be content if anticyclical policies of governments were effective in balancing economic growth with relative price stability. On the other hand, should such anticyclical policies fail to control prices adequately, we might be faced, ultimately, with the question of direct controls over prices, wages and other forms of income including rents, dividends and profits.

The leading case with respect to jurisdiction in this field is the *Board of Commerce* case (*In Re The Board of Commerce Act and the Combines and Fair Prices Act*, [1922] 1 A.C. 191, 60 D.L.R. 513). This Board of Commerce established by Parliament had, inter alia, jurisdiction to regulate profits. The Privy Council held the legislation *ultra vires* of Parliament and observed that:

It was passed in 1919, after peace had been declared, and it is not confined to any temporary purpose, but is to continue without limit in time, and to apply throughout Canada. . . . It may well be that the subjects of undue combination and hoarding are matters in which the Dominion has a great practical interest. In special circumstances, such as those of a great war, such an interest might conceivably become of such paramount and overriding importance as to amount to what lies outside the heads in sec. 92, and is not covered by them.

Although the Privy Council conceded, reluctantly from the context, that such a power might exist in time of peace, it added:

. . . it is quite another matter to say that *under normal circumstances* general Canadian policy can justify interference, on such a scale as the statutes in controversy involve, with the property and civil rights of the inhabitants of the Provinces (emphasis added).

In *Fort Frances Pulp and Power Co. Ltd. v. Manitoba Free Press*, [1923] A.C. 695, the Privy Council referred to the *Board of Commerce* case and said that in the event of a "very different case, such as that of sudden danger to social order arising from the outbreak of a great war", Parliament might act "under other powers which may well be implied in the Constitution" (emphasis added). Later the judgment stated:

This principle of a power so implied has received effect also in countries with a written and apparently rigid constitution such as the United States, where the strictly federal character of the national basic agreement has retained the residuary powers not expressly conferred on the Federal Government for the component States. The operation of the scheme of interpretation is all the more to be looked for in a constitution such as that established by the British North America Act, where the residuary powers are given to the Dominion Central Government, and the preamble of the statute declares the intention to be that the Dominion should have a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom.

It is apparent from these cases and others that effective direct control over prices and incomes is a power which the Parliament of Canada cannot lightly, or indeed easily, assume. Perhaps this is as it should be. We do not feel, however, that it is in the national interest to allow the Federal power over wages and prices to be so circumscribed as to be exercisable only in time of war or famine, or alternatively to be implied in times of highly exceptional circumstances. In practice we trust Parliament would be very circumspect in the use of any such power. But constitutionally we do not feel it is in the interests of the nation to have the power ambiguous at best, and conjectural at worst.

Consequently, we recommend that the Parliament of Canada be given the following power: in cases of national emergency, as defined by the Parliament of Canada, the Provinces shall delegate to the Federal Parliament all the additional powers necessary to control prices, wages and other forms of income, including rent, dividends and prof-

its, to implement its prime responsibility for full employment and balanced economic growth. In other words, Parliament should have whatever powers are necessary in this area, as they are required. Technically, this means that there should be Federal paramountcy as in section 95 of the British North America Act.

Chapter 34—Securities and Financial Institutions

RECOMMENDATIONS

97. The matter of securities regulation, which has hitherto been under provincial jurisdiction, should become a concurrent jurisdiction with paramountcy in the Federal Parliament.
98. Where financial institutions (trust companies, insurance companies, finance companies, credit unions, caisses populaires) do business in more than one province, they should have to meet national standards as defined by the Federal Parliament; where they confine their activities to a single province, the Province should retain exclusive jurisdiction.

The marketing of securities in Canada is a subject of major concern to Canadians. Difficulties arise from the fact that while the securities market and our financial structures are national, the jurisdiction to regulate them is Provincial. This has led to a lack of uniformity in laws and regulations from Province to Province and, consequently, to a lack of protection for the investor. In general, the major devices used in the regulation of security trading are the licensing of dealers, and laws requiring the disclosure of information to the public. At the present time this regulation is carried out by Provincial securities commissions. Federal jurisdiction is limited to sections of the Criminal Code prohibiting fraudulent dealing in securities.

Some experts have argued that the Federal Parliament possesses greater jurisdiction than it now exercises by virtue of its powers over trade and commerce, federally-incorporated companies, and the Post Office. This position, however, has not been accepted by the courts, and in practice the Provinces have occupied the field for many years. The "trade and commerce" power, which is the constitutional head under which one would expect to find the regulation of securities, was so restricted by judgments of the Privy Council that the Provinces acquired jurisdiction over the regulation of securities under their wide power over "Property and Civil rights".

Under our present system there is a lack of legislative uniformity east of Ontario and a disparity of administrative enforcement of identical laws west of Ontario. These two factors tend to undermine the welfare of Canadian investors. At the domestic level a regulatory system must ensure not only that investor confidence should remain high, but also that large financial resources are marshalled within the country to meet the demands of growth. In addition, Canada needs strong regulation to compete with American and other foreign securities standards. The weakness of Provincial laws in Canada drives investors away, in most cases to American exchanges.

While most of the above arguments favour a national jurisdiction for securities regulation, there are certain opposing views. Some fear that Federal control over securities would add to the already objectionable tendency to draw capital resources from the smaller urban centres and regions to the major markets of Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver. It might result in a one-way flow of money into these areas.

Consequently, it would be beneficial to have a system with minimum national standards but enough flexibility to provide for regional needs. There are two possibilities: Federal regulations could be used which would take account of regional interests; or the Provinces could work toward legislative uniformity through intergovernmental cooperation. After considering both possibilities, the Committee recommends that there be concurrent jurisdiction with paramountcy in the Federal Government. This would allow the Federal Government to provide minimum standards of protection for the investor, and permit the Provinces to provide additional protection.

A similar principle should also apply to financial institutions. Where financial institutions (trust companies, insurance companies, finance companies, credit unions, caisses populaires) do business in more than one province, they should have to meet national standards as defined by the Federal Parliament; where they confine their activities to a single province, the Province should retain exclusive jurisdiction.

Chapter 35—Competition

RECOMMENDATION

- 99. The Federal Parliament ought to have a concurrent power with the Provincial Legislatures over competition in order that the regulation of unfair competition in all its aspects be subject to the national interest. In the event of conflicting legislation, the Federal legislation should be paramount.**

The Federal Parliament has dealt with restrictive trade practices, that is, combinations tending to limit competition, mainly under its criminal law power. It has also joined to combines' offences other provisions allowing initial investigation and report on possible combines. The investigative body may then recommend prosecution for the substantive offences.

It seems, however, that the regulation of business combinations and the conditions under which firms might combine, consolidate or be absorbed has been considered closed to Federal regulation. There is no clear explanation why the Federal Parliament cannot regulate interprovincial or international trade, and the new Federal Competition Bill indicates a new attitude to this matter.

The primary object of restrictive trade practices legislation is to establish ground rules so that the public good will not be impaired by private conduct designed to injure consumers, producers or others (*Transport Oil Co. Ltd. v. Imperial Oil Co. Ltd.*, [1935] O.R. 215). By analogy, the primary object of adulteration legislation "is the public safety—protecting it from threatened injury" (per Macdonald, J.A. in *Standard Sausage Co. v. Lee*, [1933] 4 D.L.R. 501 (B.C.)), and the primary object of restrictive trade practices legislation is the economic "safety" of the public to protect it from any threatened injury which might result in a lessening of competition to the detriment of consumers and producers.

When the complexities and size of modern corporations are taken into account, as well as their national and international activities, it seems necessary to give the Federal Parliament constitutional power to control and regulate them in respect of competition. Many markets are dominated by a few major firms, and the degree to which a market economy exists in the classical sense has already been questioned. The ability of provinces, especially the smaller ones, to control effectively such large economic units is open to question. Consequently, the field of restrictive trade practices in the anti-trust or combines sense, as well as the expanded concept of unfair competition in

relation to consolidation, mergers and other kinds of take-overs, ought to fall under a Federal power in the Constitution.

But what kind of Federal power? Should it be exclusive, or should it be concurrent, with Federal paramountcy in case of conflicting legislation? As we have already mentioned, although the Federal Parliament under the present Constitution could perhaps legislate with respect to unfair competition in the export trade and in interprovincial trade, the practical difficulties involved in a constitutional power of that sort are obvious. For example, if an industry did not extend beyond the limits of a Province, no matter what its economic leverage might be, under an interprovincial formula the Federal Government would not have any power to regulate it. It would be free to enter into any kind of merger or take-over, despite possible repercussions on competition, and, so long as it did not extend beyond the limits of one province, regulation would be impossible. On the other hand, the Provinces might be uneasy about conferring on the Federal Parliament so important a power as that of regulating the economic climate in which business develops. The Provinces might fear that the emasculation of the Federal trade and commerce power in the present Constitution might lose its effect if the Federal Parliament secured the exclusive power to regulate competition.

The main consideration for making the Federal power exclusive lies in the fact that a very large industry might gain monopoly control over a resource or a market within a single province in Canada. However, even if the power over competition were made concurrent, this might give the Federal Parliament a large enough role. If this were done, the Federal Government would have paramountcy for reasons of overall control, but if a Province did an effective job of regulating its own business climate, there would be no need for the Federal Government to intervene with overriding legislation. It would appear that the net result of this constitutional allocation of power might be that the Federal Government would largely set standards for the export and interprovincial trade areas and the Province would basically regulate local business. However, should the Federal power be required because of the particular position of one industry located wholly within a Province then that power would be available. Giant business would then have to deal with our biggest government.

An exclusive Federal power would probably be too radical a change in view of the present state of develop-

ment of constitutional law in Canada, particularly the development of the trade and commerce clause. A concurrent power with Federal paramountcy would be a convenient half-way house between the wide powers of the Congress of the United States over interstate commerce and the much more narrowly-defined Federal power in rela-

tion to commerce now in the constitution. If economic forces continue to reward bigness, not only at national but even more at supranational levels, then Canadians may be forced to enlarge further the Federal power to supervise the rules of the economic game.

Chapter 36—Air and Water Pollution

RECOMMENDATIONS

100. **Control over the pollution of air and water should be a matter of concurrent jurisdiction between the Provincial Legislatures and the Federal Parliament, and, as in section 95 of the British North America Act, the powers of the Federal Parliament should be paramount.**
101. **The concurrency of jurisdiction over air and water pollution would necessitate both Federal-Provincial and Province-to-Province planning and coordination of programs.**
102. **We endorse the work of the Resources Ministers Council as a means of continuing consultation on matters of renewable resources.**

In recent years a totally new challenge has developed from the growing global crisis of the environment. Not only is man learning that the world's resources are finite, but also that their ever increasing consumption, particularly by the economically-developed nations, may even threaten our long-run physical and psychological survival. The dimensions of our ecological crisis are both potentially awesome and immediately urgent.

The rapid growth of population, the immense expansion of industry, and the urbanization of life have been intensified by an exploding and seemingly ungovernable technology. It is not surprising, therefore, that this subject matter, unknown and unthought of in 1867, has emerged in the current review of the Constitution.

In the evidence we heard, several themes dominated: first of all, there was a sense of urgency; also, there was a growing, militant and popularly based anti-pollution movement. The overriding feeling was that positive and extensive governmental action is needed.

Because pollution control is so urgently needed, we feel that any confusion which exists in constitutional powers should be ended as quickly as possible.

Canada is seriously affected, although there is clearly a global scope to the phenomenon of environmental pollution. Lake Erie, we are told, is in danger of dying and her sister lakes may gradually succumb. Wildlife is being poisoned by pesticides. Cities are enveloped in smog affecting health. Rising crescendos of noise threaten tranquillity everywhere. Clean air, clear water and the purity of our

soil and our sea products can no longer be assumed in Canada.

Our evidence revealed a deep concern to protect that peace and beauty essential to sustain the human spirit. Our witnesses also recognized that, increasingly, havens of peace and beauty are being surrounded and eliminated by air and water pollution.

It was conceded by virtually all witnesses that concerted action on the international, national, provincial and urban levels of government will be required. Any constitutional approach must, therefore, be flexible.

There seems to be widespread agreement that jurisdiction over pollution is at present complicated at best and confusing at worst. Federal and Provincial sources in the B.N.A. Act for pollution control are many. For example, Provincial jurisdiction may stem from "Property and Civil Rights in the Province", "Municipal Institutions in the Province", "Local Works and Undertakings", "Generally all Matters of a merely local or private Nature in the Province". Federal jurisdiction, on the other hand, depending on the class of subject dealt with in the legislation, might arise from "The Criminal Law", "Navigation and Shipping", "Sea Coast and Inland Fisheries", and "The Regulation of Trade and Commerce".

The possibilities for jurisdictional overlapping here revealed show the difficulties of determining constitutional and political accountability. Although the respective powers are legally and narrowly "exclusive" in the strict sense, pollution problems do not always fit into such neat, compartmental packages. Consequently, the lines of political accountability are not clear. The voter is left with his annoyance; the politician with his constitutional enigmas. What is clear is that the witnesses who appeared before us recognized that pollution has local, provincial, national and international aspects. Rather than getting bogged down as to whether the pollution to be cured was a "Fisheries" or a "Navigation" or a "Management of Public Lands" or a "Local Works and Undertaking" problem, they felt that pollution itself should be the subject matter of concern to Parliament and the Legislatures. They felt that pollution of air and water, because of their many facets, should be a concurrent power shared by both Parliament and the Legislatures.

The object in making air and water pollution a specific head of power is to avoid, as completely as possible, jurisdictional conflicts based on existing powers: for

example, whether the legislation is, in pith and substance, in relation to "Public Lands" (Provincial) or "Inland Fisheries" (Federal). The same reasoning compels us to acknowledge that, in the event of conflict between the new concurrent Federal and Provincial powers in the area of air and water pollution, Federal legislation should be paramount. Consequently, we recommend a similar concurrent formulation for jurisdiction over pollution of air and water as already exists in section 95 of the British North America Act, with respect to Immigration and Agriculture. A similar power in this area might read this way:

In each Province the Legislature may make Laws in relation to the control of air and water pollution in the Province; and it is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may, from Time to Time, make Laws in relation to the control of air and water pollution among the Provinces; and any Law of the Legislature of a Province relative to the control of air and water pollution shall have effect in and for the Province as long and as far only as it is not repugnant to any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

Apart from the purely legal considerations which call for a paramount Federal power in the area of air and water pollution, there are compelling economic arguments. Because of the disparities in economic terms which exist between the Provinces in Canada, to fail to have a paramount Federal power would be to invite Provinces to compete for industrial development on the basis of more relaxed pollution laws. It is only recognizing the obvious to suggest that some economically-weaker Provinces would be unable to resist the temptation.

We would envisage, because the new pollution power would be concurrent, that necessarily greater Federal-

Provincial and Province-to-Province planning and co-ordination would result. The superior financial and research capabilities of the Federal Government, especially in relation to the smaller Provinces, can be brought into play through the concurrent power itself and through the Federal spending power, if necessary.

Although we have provided for Federal paramountcy, this does not mean that we contemplate a total and complete Federal occupation of the field of air and water pollution. Indeed we expect legislative coordination between the two levels. We support Federal paramountcy to ensure, however, that should the national interest require it, the Parliament of Canada can ensure that no Province could become a pollution haven. Of course, it would also ensure that pollution of the air and water of one Province by another, and pollution with international effects, could be governed by Federal legislation if deadlock arose or if there was irreconcilable legislation.

The whole question of environmental management is a very broad one. It covers not only pollution control but many other subjects such as land use control, control over mining, lumber, wildlife and fish, agriculture, land reclamation and abandonment, weather forecasting and weather modification, recreation and leisure activities, transportation, electric power, multiple-use water management, housing and urban planning and noise abatement.

It is not possible, at the moment, to see how far this concept goes. Consequently, we have rejected the idea of describing the specific pollution power in the Constitution as a power over "environmental management". That is why we have limited our recommendations to a constitutional formulation to cover jurisdiction over air and water pollution.

Chapter 37—Foreign Ownership and Canadian Independence

RECOMMENDATIONS

103. The power of the Federal Parliament with respect to aliens should be clarified to ensure that Parliament has paramount power to deal with problems of foreign ownership.
104. The Federal Parliament should have the clear power to nationalize industry and expropriate land threatened by foreign takeovers or control contrary to the national interest.
105. The Federal Parliament should have jurisdiction over citizenship, and that power should include the power to promote national unity and a national spirit and to create institutions for these purposes.

Throughout the hearings of the Committee there was a recurring concern for Canadian independence, sovereignty, unity and identity. Certain witnesses expressed their alarm over the large percentage of Canadian land, resources and industry owned by non-Canadians and especially by Americans. They referred to our recreation land, our mining, oil and gas industries, our publishing and text-book industries, etc. It was established that American investment is 80% of the total foreign investment in Canada and that 76% of all companies in Canada with assets over \$25 million are foreign owned. Fears were expressed that Canadian citizens might lose political as well as economic control of their own country; that they would be barred from the best jobs and the best land; that they would be run by absentee landlords; and that Canadian people and resources would be working for the enrichment of other peoples and other lands.

This concern over the economic domination of our country can be closely related to other concerns expressed before the Committee, such as the lack of national unity and a vigorous national purpose, the tendency to regionalism, the proliferation of hyphenated Canadians who cling to the nationality or symbols of their mother countries, misunderstanding and differences between French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians, old and new Canadians, older and younger Canadians, native born Canadians and immigrants. As a multicultural country, it is all the more important for Canada to insist on a substratum of national unity. Unless Canadians do develop a definite solidarity among themselves and a conscious attachment to their country, territory and resources, they will not be able to deal with the threat of foreign economic domination and may not survive as a

nation. There must be not only a regional solidarity and attachment, but a national one. All Canadians must consider themselves undivided owners of all Canadian territory and partners or trustees in its management. There should be no second-class citizens and all must feel at home in every part of the land. To develop a positive nationalism we must know more about our country and each other. We must take more interest in our history, our music, our arts, our national institutions and associations. On our success in these things our independence, our sovereignty and our unity will depend. We shall become "masters of our own house" in Canada.

It is proper to ask what the constitutional implications of these concerns and aspirations are. With respect to national unity, national symbols and national powers, there is no doubt. We have discussed these in other chapters. Here, however, we must emphasize that these matters cannot be discussed in isolation. They are closely related to the problems of foreign ownership and of economic and political independence. Without Canadian institutions to promote a Canadian national spirit, there will be no political will to act resolutely against foreign ownership. Consequently, the Federal Parliament must have the necessary powers to deal with all aspects of political and economic independence.

There was some discussion by witnesses as to whether or not the Federal Parliament did have such powers. Witnesses pointed out that jurisdiction over land and resources is overwhelmingly Provincial, while naturalization and aliens and citizenship are Federal responsibilities. There is some uncertainty, however, as to how effectively the powers over aliens and citizenship could be used to control foreign corporations, investors, and entrepreneurs operating in Canada. While Section 24(1) of the Canadian Citizenship Act does set out certain rights for aliens and asserts that they can hold property, this jurisdictional head of the B.N.A. Act has never been much used. In a sense the Provinces partially occupy the field through the enactment of mortmain acts and other similar measures. Consequently, while the Federal use of the power over aliens could be pushed to greater limits, it might not prevail over Provincial powers, especially those relating to land and resources. This uncertainty is compounded by the disagreements relating to the Federal treaty-making power and international relations.

We therefore recommend that the Federal power with respect to aliens be clarified so that the Federal Parliament would have, beyond any dispute, paramount power

to deal with problems arising from foreign ownership. Further, the Federal Parliament should have the clear power to nationalize and expropriate land, resources and industries which are threatened by foreign takeovers or control contrary to the national interest. Finally, the Fed-

eral Parliament should continue to have jurisdiction over citizenship, and that power should include the power to promote national unity and a national spirit and to create institutions for these purposes.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

PART I—THE CONSTITUTION

Chapter 1—Constitutional Imperatives

1. Canada should have a new and distinctively Canadian Constitution, one which would be a new whole even though it would utilize many of the same parts.
2. A new Canadian Constitution should be based on functional considerations, which would lead to greater decentralization of governmental powers in all areas touching culture and social policy and to greater centralization in powers which have important economic effects at the national level. Functional considerations also require greater decentralization in many areas of governmental administration.

Chapter 4—Patriation of the Constitution

3. The Canadian Constitution should be patriated by a procedure which would provide for a simultaneous proclamation of a new Constitution by Canada and the renunciation by Britain of all jurisdiction over the Canadian Constitution.

Chapter 5—Amendments to the Constitution

4. The formula for amending the Constitution should be that contained in the Victoria Charter of June 1971, which requires the agreement of the Federal Parliament and a majority of the Provincial Legislatures, including those of:
 - (a) every province which at any time has contained twenty-five per cent of the population of Canada;
 - (b) at least two Atlantic Provinces;
 - (c) at least two Western Provinces that have a combined population of at least fifty percent of the population of all the Western Provinces.

Chapter 6—The Preamble to the Constitution

5. The Canadian Constitution should have a preamble which would proclaim the basic objectives of Canadian federal democracy.

PART II—THE PEOPLE

Chapter 7—Self-Determination

6. The preamble of the Constitution should recognize that the Canadian federation is based on the liberty of the person and the protection of basic human rights as a fundamental and essential purpose of the State. Consequently, the preamble should also recognize that the existence of Canadian society rests on the free consent of its citizens and their collective will to live together, and that any differences among them should be settled by peaceful means.
7. If the citizens of a part of Canada at some time democratically declared themselves in favour of a political arrangement which were contrary to the continuation of our present political structures, the disagreement should be resolved by political negotiation, not by the use of military or other coercive force.
8. We reaffirm our conviction that all of the peoples of Canada can achieve their aspirations more effectively within a federal system, and we believe Canadians should strive to maintain such a system.

Chapter 8—Native Peoples

9. No constitutional changes concerning native peoples should be made until such time as their own organizations have completed their research into the question of treaty and aboriginal rights in Canada.
10. The preamble of the new Constitution should affirm the special place of native peoples, including Métis, in Canadian life.
11. Provincial governments should, where the population is sufficient, consider recognizing Indian languages as regional languages.
12. No jurisdictional changes should be made in administrative arrangements concerning Indians and Eskimos without consultation with them.

Chapter 9—Fundamental Rights

13. Canada should have a Bill of Rights entrenched in the Constitution, guaranteeing the political freedoms

of conscience and religion, of thought, opinion and expression, of peaceful assembly and of association.

14. The Bill of Rights should include a provision requiring fair and equitable representation in the House of Commons and in the Provincial Legislatures.
15. The right to citizenship, once legally acquired, should be made inalienable under the Bill of Rights.
16. The individual person should be constitutionally protected in his life, liberty and the security of his person so as not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.
17. The individual person should be constitutionally protected against the arbitrary seizure of his property, except for the public good and for just compensation.
18. The Constitution should prohibit discrimination by reason of sex, race, ethnic origin, colour or religion by proclaiming the right of the individual to equal treatment by law.
19. Discrimination in employment, or in membership in professional, trade or other occupational associations, or in obtaining public accommodation and services, or in owning, renting or holding property should also be declared contrary to the Bill of Rights.
20. Other provisions already contained in the Canadian Bill of Rights (1960) protecting legal rights should also be included in the Constitutional Bill of Rights: protection against unreasonable searches and seizures, the right to be informed promptly of the reason for arrest, the right to counsel, the right to habeas corpus, protection against self-crimination, the right to a fair hearing, the right to be presumed innocent and not to be denied reasonable bail without just cause, the right to an interpreter, the proscribing of retroactive penal laws or punishments, and the right not to be subjected to cruel and unusual punishment.
21. The rights and freedoms recognized by the Bill of Rights should not be interpreted as absolute and unlimited, but should rather be exercisable to the extent that they are reasonably justifiable in a democratic society.

Chapter 10—Language Rights

22. French and English should be constitutionally entrenched as the two official languages of Canada.
23. The Constitution should recognize:
 - (a) the right of any person to use either official language in the Federal and Provincial Legislatures and the Territorial Councils;
 - (b) the right to have access in both official languages to the legislative records, journals, and enactments of Canada, New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec and the Territories;
 - (c) the right to use either official language in dealing with judicial or quasi-judicial Federal bodies or

with courts in New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec and the Territories;

- (d) the right to communicate in either official language with Federal departments and agencies and with provincial departmental head offices or agency head offices in New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec and the Territories.
24. All of the rights in recommendation 23 (b) (c) and (d) should also be exercisable in:
 - (a) any Province where each language is the mother tongue of ten per cent of the population;
 - (b) in any Province where the legislature declares French and English the official languages of the province.
25. The Constitution should recognize parents' right to have English or French provided as their child's main language of instruction in publicly supported schools in areas where the language of their choice is chosen by a sufficient number of persons to justify the provision of the necessary facilities.
26. We support the general objective of making French the working language in Quebec. We hope that through the studies being carried out in Quebec on this matter, this objective can be reached with due respect for certain Quebec Anglophone institutions, and taking into account the North American and world reality.
27. The preamble to the Constitution should formally recognize that Canada is a multicultural country.
28. The Constitution should explicitly recognize the right of Provincial Legislatures to confer equivalent status with the English and French languages on other languages. Federal financial assistance to support the teaching or use of other languages would be appropriate.

Chapter 11—Regional Disparities

29. The equitable distribution of income should be recognized in the preamble of the Constitution as a dynamic and humane objective of our social policy. Consequently, we agree with the principle stated in the Victoria Charter that:

The Parliament and Government of Canada and the Legislatures and Governments of the Provinces are committed to... the promotion of equality of opportunity and well-being for all individuals in Canada.

30. We agree with the statement in the Victoria Charter that:

The Parliament and Government of Canada and the Legislatures and Governments of the Provinces are committed to... the assurance, as nearly as possible, that essential public services of reasonable quality are available to all individuals in Canada.

This objective should be recognized in the preamble of the Constitution.

31. The preamble of the Constitution should provide that every Canadian should have access to adequate federal, provincial and municipal services without having to bear a disproportionate tax burden because of the region in which he lives. This recommendation follows logically from our acceptance of the principle of equality of opportunity for all Canadians.
32. We completely accept the following objective as stated in the Victoria Charter:

The promotion of economic development to reduce disparities in the social and economic opportunities for all individuals in Canada wherever they may live.

As in the case of redistribution of income among individuals and for the same reasons, this objective should be recognized in the preamble of the Constitution.

PART III—FEDERAL INSTITUTIONS

Chapter 12—The Head of State

33. Because of the state of divided opinion in Canada, the Committee does not recommend any change in the monarchical system at the present time.
34. The Committee itself prefers a Canadian as Head of State, and supports the evolutionary process by which the Governor General has been granted more functions as the Head of State for Canada. Eventually, the question of retaining or abolishing the Monarchy will have to be decided by way of clear consultation with the Canadian people.

Chapter 13—The Senate

35. The present full veto power of the Senate over legislation should be reduced to a suspensive veto for six months according to the following formula: a bill may become law without the consent of the Senate (1) if the House of Commons, having once passed it, passes it again no less than six months after it was rejected or finally amended by the Senate, or, (2) if, within 6 months of third reading of a bill by the House of Commons the Senate has not completed consideration of it, and the House of Commons again passes it at any time after the expiration of the 6 months, but any period when Parliament is prorogued or dissolved shall not be counted in computing the 6 months.
36. The investigating role of the Senate, which has gained more importance in recent years, should be continued and expanded at the initiative of the Senate itself, and the Government should also make more use of the Senate in this way.
37. The Government should be entitled to introduce in the Senate all bills including money bills but excluding appropriation bills, before their approval by the House of Commons, provided that, in the case of money bills, they should be introduced by the leader of the Government in the Senate on behalf of the Government.

38. The distribution of Senators should be as follows: Newfoundland 6, Prince Edward Island 4, Nova Scotia 10, New Brunswick 10, Quebec 24, Ontario 24, Manitoba 12, Saskatchewan 12, Alberta 12, British Columbia 12, the Yukon Territory 2, and the Northwest Territories 2: a total of 130.

39. All Senators should continue to be appointed by the Federal Government: as vacancies occur in the present Senate, one-half of the Senators from each Province and Territory should be appointed in the same manner as at present; the other half from each Province and Territory should be appointed by the Federal Government from a panel of nominees submitted by the appropriate Provincial or Territorial Government.
40. The personal requirements for appointment to the Senate should be limited to those required for eligibility as an elector in the Canada Elections Act, plus residence in the province for which a Senator is appointed. The Quebec structure of electoral divisions should be abolished.

41. The compulsory retirement age for all new senators should be seventy years. Upon retirement, Senators should retain the right to the title and precedence of Senators and the right to participate in the work of the Senate or of its Committee, but not the right to vote or to receive the indemnity of Senators.

Chapter 14—The House of Commons

42. The mechanism of redistribution of seats in the House of Commons as well as the limitations implied in the 15 per cent rule and the Senate rule should be retained in the Constitution. The formula of representation, however, subject to our recommendations on the Bill of Rights, should be the exclusive prerogative of the House of Commons, to be dealt with by ordinary legislation.
43. Every House of Commons should continue for four years, from the day of the return of the writs for choosing the House and no longer, provided that, and notwithstanding any Royal Prerogative, the Governor General should have the power to dissolve Parliament during that period:

(1) when the Government is defeated

(a) on a motion expressing no confidence in the Government; or

(b) on a vote on a specific bill or portion of a bill which the Government has previously declared should be construed as a motion of want of confidence; or

(2) when the House of Commons passes a resolution requesting dissolution of Parliament.

Chapter 15—The Supreme Court of Canada

44. The existence, independence and structure of the Supreme Court of Canada should be provided for in the Constitution.

45. Consultation with the Provinces on appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada must take place. We generally support the methods of consultation proposed in the Victoria Charter, but the Provinces should also be allowed to make nominations to the nominating councils which would be set up under the Victoria proposals if the Attorney-General of Canada and the Attorney-General of a province fail to agree on an appointee.
46. The Provinces should be given the right to withdraw appeals in matters of strictly provincial law from the Supreme Court of Canada and to vest final decision on such matters in their own highest courts, thus leaving to the Supreme Court of Canada jurisdiction over matters of Federal law and of constitutional law, including the Bill of Rights. The issue of whether a matter was one of strictly provincial law would be subject to determination by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Chapter 16—The National Capital Area

47. There should be a movement by stages towards the possible creation of an autonomous Canadian Capital.
48. The Canadian Capital should be generally the areas of Ontario and of Quebec now defined in the schedule to the National Capital Act (1959).

PART IV—THE GOVERNMENTS

Chapter 17—The Division of Powers

49. The use of exclusive lists of Federal and Provincial powers, but with an extended list of concurrent powers, should be continued.
50. Concurrent powers which predominantly affect the national interest should grant paramountcy to the Federal Parliament and those which predominantly affect Provincial or local interests should grant paramountcy to the Provincial legislatures.
51. The Constitution should permit the delegation of executive and administrative powers (as at present), but not of legislative powers except where expressly specified in this Report.

Chapter 18—The General Legislative Power of Parliament

52. The "Peace, Order, and good Government" power should be retained in the Constitution as an expression of the overriding Federal legislative power over matters of a national nature.
53. Since the Federal General Legislative Power is counterbalanced by a Provincial power over matters of a Provincial or local nature, there is no place for a purely residuary power.

Chapter 19—Taxing Powers

54. Generally speaking and subject to recommendation 55, we endorse the principle that the Federal and

Provincial Governments should have access to all fields of taxation. However, in order to bring about a division of revenues that may accurately reflect the priorities of each government, there should be Federal-Provincial consultations to determine the most equitable means of apportioning joint fields of taxation in the light of:

- (a) the projected responsibilities of each level of government in the immediate future;
- (b) the anticipated increases in their respective expenditures;
- (c) economic and administrative limitations, such as preserving sufficient leverage for the Federal Government, by means of its taxation system, to discharge effectively its function of managing the economy.

55. Provincial legislatures should have the right to impose indirect taxes provided that they do not impede interprovincial or international trade and do not fall on persons resident in other Provinces. These limitations could be satisfied by tax collection through an interprovincial or Federal-Provincial collection agency, or by tax collection agreements.

Chapter 20—The Federal Spending Power

56. The power of the Federal Parliament to make conditional grants for general Federal-Provincial (shared-cost) programs should be subject to the establishment of a national consensus both for the institution of any new program and for the continuation of any existing one. A consensus would be established by the affirmative vote of the Legislatures in three of the four regions of Canada according to the following formula: the vote of the Legislatures in the Atlantic region would be considered to be in the affirmative if any two of the Legislatures of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Newfoundland were in favour; the vote of the Legislatures of the Western region would be considered to be in the affirmative with the agreement of any two of the four Legislatures. The consensus for existing joint programs should be tested every 10 years.
57. If a Province does not wish to participate in a program for which there is a national consensus, the Federal Government should pay the Government of that Province a sum equal to the amount it would have cost the Federal Government to implement the program in the Province. However, a tax collection fee of about 1 per cent, equivalent to the cost of collecting the money paid to the Province, should be deducted from the amount paid to such non-participating Provinces.
58. In order that the objectives of joint programs may be more effectively realized, conditional Federal grants should preferably be based on the cost of the programs in each Province. However, since a 50-50 cost-sharing formula, when applied to the expenditures made in each Province, constitutes too great an incentive in high-income Provinces, conditional Federal grants should not be made for that portion of Provincial expenditures which lies above the national average cost of the service. The maximum per

capita amount to which a Province would be entitled would thus correspond to the per capita national expenditure, and additional expenditures by a Provincial Government would in no way increase the Federal grant to that Province.

Chapter 21—Intergovernmental Relations

59. More communication and fuller cooperation among all levels of government are imperative needs. The achievement of these ends involves the improvement and simplification of the means of liaison and, where necessary, the creation of new mechanisms.
60. The Constitution should provide for a Federal-Provincial Conference of First Ministers to be called by the Prime Minister of Canada at least once a year unless in any year a majority of the First Ministers decide to dispense with the Conference.
61. The Federal Government should appoint a Minister of State for Intergovernmental Affairs to respond to the political challenges and opportunities resulting from closer intergovernmental relationships.
62. A permanent Federal-Provincial secretariat for intergovernmental relations should be established.
63. A tri-level conference among Federal, Provincial and Municipal governments should be called at least once a year.

Chapter 22—Municipalities

64. While we recognize the difficulties of larger cities in providing for their needs, financing their programs and determining their own priorities, as well as in negotiating with the Provincial and Federal Governments on works which seriously affect municipal planning, and also their need for more status and more autonomy in order to achieve these goals, we do not see how these matters can be entrenched in the Constitution. They should be negotiated between the cities and the Provincial Governments under whose jurisdiction they fall.
65. The municipalities in each Province, in conjunction with their provincial and national bodies, should determine which representatives from what municipalities would attend the annual tri-level conferences we have recommended in Recommendation 63.
66. Such tri-level meetings would not have the power of veto over any Federal or Provincial programs but would rather operate by way of moral suasion.
67. In the light of the injustice done municipalities by their having to rely on the property tax for the bulk of their revenue, there should be a sharing of tax fields between Governments that would allow municipalities direct access to other sources of revenue.
68. Where feasible, representatives of municipalities should meet with other levels of government to discuss common problems particularly in the area of economic planning through representation at meet-

ings of the Ministers of Finance and Provincial Treasurers.

Chapter 23—The Territories

69. The objective of Government policy for the Yukon and the Northwest Territories should be the fostering of self-government and provincial status.
70. The provisions of the British North America Act, 1871, section 2, which provide for the admission of new provinces by action of the Federal Government alone, should be continued, provided that no territory should become a province without its consent.
71. The Yukon and the Northwest Territories should each be entitled to representation in the Senate.

Chapter 24—Offshore Mineral Rights

72. The Federal Government should have proprietary rights over the seabed offshore to the limit of Canada's internationally recognized jurisdiction, and the Federal Parliament should have full legislative jurisdiction over this subject matter.
73. There should be no constitutional provision as to the sharing of the profits from the exploitation of seabed resources. Nevertheless, we feel strongly that the Federal Government should share the profits of seabed development equally with the adjacent coastal Province rather than with all of the Provinces.
74. Sable Island should be recognized by the Constitution as part of the Province of Nova Scotia.

Chapter 25—International Relations

75. Section 132 of the British North America Act should be repealed.
76. The Constitution should make it clear that: the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction over foreign policy, the making of treaties, and the exchange of diplomatic and consular representatives.
77. All formal treaties should be ratified by Parliament rather than by the Executive Branch of Government.
78. The Government of Canada should, before binding itself to perform under a treaty an obligation that deals with a matter falling within the legislative competence of the Provinces, consult with the Government of each Province that may be affected by the obligation.
79. The Government of a Province should remain free not to take any action with respect to an obligation undertaken by the Government of Canada under a treaty unless it has agreed to do so.
80. Subject to a veto power in the Government of Canada in the exercise of its exclusive power with respect to foreign policy, the Provincial Governments should have the right to enter into contracts, and administrative, reciprocal and other arrangements with foreign states, or constituent parts of foreign states, to maintain offices abroad for the conduct of Provincial business, and generally to

cooperate with the Government of Canada in its international activities.

PART V—SOCIAL POLICY

Chapter 26—Social Security

81. In the area of social security, there should be a greater decentralization of jurisdiction with a view to giving priority to the Provinces according to recommendations 82, 83 and 84.
82. With respect to social services, the present exclusive jurisdiction of Provincial Legislatures should be retained.
83. With respect to income insurance (including the Quebec and Canada Pension Plans), jurisdiction should be shared according to the present section 94A of the British North America Act, subject to the following exceptions:
 - (1) Workmen's Compensation should be retained under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures;
 - (2) Unemployment Insurance should be retained under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Canadian Parliament.
84. With respect to income support measures:
 - (1) Financial social assistance (Canada Assistance Plan, allowances to the blind, disability allowances, unemployment assistance) should be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures;
 - (2) Veterans' allowances and allowances to Eskimos and Indians living on reserves should continue to be the exclusive responsibility of the Canadian Parliament;
 - (3) Demographic grants (old age pensions, family allowances and youth allowances) and guaranteed income payments (guaranteed income supplement) should be matters of concurrent jurisdiction with limited Provincial paramountcy as to the scale of benefits and the allocation of Federal funds among these income support programs. Thus the Federal Parliament would retain concurrent power to establish programs and to pay benefits to individuals under these programs. However, a Province would have the right to vary the national scheme established by Parliament with respect to the allocation within the Province between the various programs of the total amount determined by the Federal Government and with respect to the scale of benefits paid to individuals within the Province according to income, number of children, etc., within each program; provided that the benefits paid to individuals under each program should not be less than a certain percentage (perhaps half or two-thirds) of the amounts which would be paid under the scheme proposed by the Federal Government.

Chapter 27—Criminal Law

85. Since we believe that each Province should be able to regulate the conduct of its own people in such matters as the operation of motor vehicles, Sunday observance, betting and lotteries, the Federal Parliament should have the right to delegate even to a single Province legislative jurisdiction over any part of the criminal law.
86. Because there is some ambiguity resulting from current practice, if not from the Constitution, the Federal power over the administration of criminal justice should be made clear so that the Federal Parliament would be seen to have clear and undoubted jurisdiction to enforce its own laws in the criminal field.

Chapter 28—Marriage and Divorce

87. In keeping with our principle of control by the Provinces of their social destiny, the jurisdiction over "Marriage and Divorce" should be transferred to the Provincial Legislatures, subject to an agreed common definition of domicile.

Chapter 29—Education

88. Education as such should remain an exclusively Provincial power as at present, subject to the guarantees for minorities set out elsewhere in this Report.
89. The Provinces should create a permanent office for cooperation and coordination in education, and Federal participation should be confined to the area of Federal jurisdiction over the education of native peoples, immigrants, and defence personnel and dependents.

Chapter 30—Communications

90. The Parliament of Canada should retain exclusive jurisdiction over the means in broadcasting and other systems of communication.
91. The Provinces should have exclusive jurisdiction over the program content in provincial educational broadcasting, whatever means of communication is employed.

PART VI—THE REGULATION OF THE ECONOMY

Chapter 31—Economic Policy

92. The Federal Parliament and Government should retain the primary responsibility for general economic policy designed to achieve national economic goals. This means that they must have sufficient economic powers to regulate the economy through structural, monetary and fiscal policies.

93. National economic policies should take more account of regional objectives through coordinating mechanisms between governments and through considerable administrative decentralization in the operation of the Federal Government and its agencies.

94. Provincial and municipal governments should also take more account of national economic objectives.

Chapter 32—Trade and Commerce

95. Parliament should have exclusive jurisdiction over international and interprovincial trade and commerce, including the instrumentalities of such trade and commerce. Intraprovincial trade and commerce should remain under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures.

Chapter 33—Income Controls

96. In cases of national emergency, as defined by the Parliament of Canada, the Provinces should delegate to the Federal Parliament all additional powers necessary to control prices, wages and other forms of income, including rent, dividends and profits, to implement its prime responsibility for full employment and balanced economic growth.

Chapter 34—Securities and Financial Institutions

97. The matter of securities regulation, which has hitherto been under provincial jurisdiction, should become a concurrent jurisdiction with paramountcy in the Federal Parliament.

98. Where financial institutions (trust companies, insurance companies, finance companies, credit unions, caisses populaires) do business in more than one province, they should have to meet national standards as defined by the Federal Parliament; where they confine their activities to a single province, the Province should retain exclusive jurisdiction.

Chapter 35—Competition

99. The Federal Parliament ought to have a concurrent power with the Provincial Legislatures over competition in order that the regulation of unfair competition in all its aspects be subject to the national interest. In the event of conflicting legislation, the federal legislation should be paramount.

Chapter 36—Air and Water Pollution

100. Control over the pollution of air and water should be a matter of concurrent jurisdiction between the Provincial Legislatures and the Federal Parliament, and, as in section 95 of the British North America Act, the powers of the Federal Parliament should be paramount.

101. The concurrency of jurisdiction over the air and water pollution would necessitate both Federal-Provincial and Province-to-Province planning and co-ordination of programs.

102. We endorse the work of the Resources Ministers Council as a means of continuing consultation on matters of renewable resources.

Chapter 37—Foreign Ownership and Canadian Independence

103. The power of the Federal Parliament with respect to aliens should be clarified to ensure that Parliament has paramount power to deal with problems of foreign ownership.

104. The Federal Parliament should have the clear power to nationalize industry and expropriate land threatened by foreign takeovers or control contrary to the national interest.

105. The Federal Parliament should have jurisdiction over citizenship, and that power should include the power to promote national unity and a national spirit and to create institutions for these purposes.

APPENDIX A

Extracts from the British North America Act

Powers of the Parliament

91. It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make Laws for the Peace, Order and good Government of Canada, in relation to all Matters not coming within the Classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces; and for greater Certainty, but not so as to restrict the Generality of the foregoing Terms of this Section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this Act) the exclusive Legislative Authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all Matters coming within the Classes of Subjects next herein-after enumerated; that is to say,—

1. The amendment from time to time of the Constitution of Canada, except as regards matters coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the provinces, or as regards rights or privileges by this or any other Constitutional Act granted or secured to the Legislature or the Government of a province, or to any class of persons with respect to schools or as regards the use of the English or the French language or as regards the requirements that there shall be a session of the Parliament of Canada at least one each year, and that no House of Commons shall continue for more than five years from the day of the return of the Writs for choosing the House: Provided, however, that a House of Commons may in time of real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection be continued by the Parliament of Canada if such continuation is not opposed by the votes of more than one-third of the members of such House.

[NOTE: Added by the British North America Act (No. 2), 1949, 13 Geo. VI, c. 81 (U.K.).]

1A. The Public Debt and Property.

[NOTE: Re-numbered 1A by the British North America Act (No. 2), 1949, 13 Geo. VI, c. 81 (U.K.).]

2. The Regulation of Trade and Commerce.

2A. Unemployment insurance.

[NOTE: Added by the British North America Act, 1940, 3-4 Geo. VI, c. 36 (U.K.).]

3. The raising of Money by any Mode or System of Taxation.

4. The borrowing of Money on the Public Credit.

5. Postal Service.

6. The Census and Statistics.

7. Militia, Military and Naval Service, and Defence.

8. The fixing of and providing for the Salaries and Allowances of Civil and other Officers of the Government of Canada.

9. Beacons, Buoys, Lighthouses, and Sable Island.

10. Navigation and Shipping.

11. Quarantine and the Establishment and Maintenance of Marine Hospitals.

12. Sea Coast and Inland Fisheries.

13. Ferries between a Province and any British or Foreign Country or between Two Provinces.

14. Currency and Coinage.

15. Banking, Incorporation of Banks, and the Issue of Paper Money.

16. Savings Banks.

17. Weights and Measures.

18. Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes.

19. Interest.

20. Legal Tender.

21. Bankruptcy and Insolvency.

22. Patents of Invention and Discovery.

23. Copyrights.

24. Indians, and Lands reserved for the Indians.

25. Naturalization and Aliens.

26. Marriage and Divorce.

27. The Criminal Law, except the Constitution of Courts of Criminal Jurisdiction, but including the Procedure in Criminal Matters.

28. The Establishment, Maintenance, and Management of Penitentiaries.

29. Such Classes of Subjects as are expressly excepted in the Enumeration of the Classes of Subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces.

And any Matter coming within any of the Classes of Subjects enumerated in this Section shall not be deemed to come within the Class of Matters of a local or private Nature comprised in the Enumeration of the Classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces.

Exclusive Powers of Provincial Legislatures

92. In each Province the Legislature may exclusively make Laws in relation to Matters coming within the Classes of Subjects next herein-after enumerated; that is to say,—

1. The Amendment from Time to Time, notwithstanding anything in this Act, of the Constitution of the Province, except as regards the Office of Lieutenant Governor.

2. Direct Taxation within the Province in order to the raising of a Revenue for Provincial Purposes.

3. The borrowing of Money on the sole Credit of the Province.

4. The Establishment and Tenure of Provincial Offices and the Appointment and Payment of Provincial Officers.

5. The Management and Sale of the Public Lands belonging to the Province and of the Timber and Wood thereon.

6. The Establishment, Maintenance, and Management of Public and Reformatory Prisons in and for the Province.

7. The Establishment, Maintenance, and Management of Hospitals, Asylums, Charities, and Eleemosynary Institutions in and for the Province, other than Marine Hospitals.

8. Municipal Institutions in the Province.

9. Shop, Saloon, Tavern, Auctioneer, and other Licences in order to the raising of a Revenue for Provincial, Local, or Municipal Purposes.

10. Local Works and Undertakings other than such as are of the following Classes:—

a. Lines of Steam or other Ships, Railways, Canals, Telegraphs, and other Works and Undertakings connecting the Province with any other or others of the Provinces, or extending beyond the Limits of the Province:

b. Lines of Steam Ships between the Province and any British or Foreign Country:

c. Such Works as, although wholly situate within the Province, are before or after their Execution declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general Advantage of Canada or for the Advantage of Two or more of the Provinces.

11. The Incorporation of Companies with Provincial Objects.

12. The Solemnization of Marriage in the Province.

13. Property and Civil Rights in the Province.

14. The Administration of Justice in the Province, including the Constitution, Maintenance, and Organization of Provincial Courts, both of Civil and of Criminal Jurisdiction, and including Procedure in Civil Matters in those Courts.

15. The Imposition of Punishment by Fine, Penalty, or Imprisonment for enforcing any Law of the Province made in relation to any Matter coming within any of the Classes of Subjects enumerated in this Section.

16. Generally all Matters of a merely local or private Nature in the Province.

Education

93. In and for each Province the Legislature may exclusively make Laws in relation to Education, subject and according to the following Provisions:—

(1) Nothing in any such Law shall prejudicially affect any Right or Privilege with respect to Denominational Schools which any Class of Persons have by Law in the Province at the Union:

(2) All the Powers, Privileges, and Duties at the Union by Law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the Separate Schools and School Trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic Subjects shall be and the same are hereby extended to the Dissident Schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic Subjects in Quebec:

(3) Where in any Province a System of Separate or Dissident Schools exists by Law at the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the Province, an Appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any Act or Decision of any Provincial Authority affecting any Right or Privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic Minority of the Queen's Subjects in relation to Education:

(4) In case any such Provincial Law as from Time to Time seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due Execution of the Provisions of this Section is not made, or in case any Decision of the Governor General in Council on any Appeal under this Section is not duly executed by the proper Provincial Authority in that Behalf, then and in every such Case, and as far only as the Circumstances of each Case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial Laws for the due Execution of the Provisions of this Section and of any Decision of the Governor General in Council under this Section.

[NOTE: Altered for Manitoba by section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 1870, 33 Vict., c. 3 (Canada) (confirmed by the British North America Act, 1871); for Alberta by section 17 of the Alberta Act, 4-5 Edw. VII, c. 3 (Canada); for Saskatchewan, by section 17 of the Saskatchewan Act, 4-5 Edw. VII, c. 42 (Canada); and for Newfoundland by Term 17 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada, confirmed by the British North America Act, 1949, 12-13 Geo. VI, c. 22 (U.K.).]

Uniformity of Laws in Ontario, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick

94. Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the Parliament of Canada may make Provision for the Uniformity of all or any of the Laws relative to Property and Civil Rights in Ontario, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and of the Procedure of all or any of the Courts in those Three Provinces, and from and after the passing of any Act in that Behalf the Power of the Parliament of Canada to make Laws in relation to any Matter comprised in any such Act shall, notwithstanding anything in this Act, be unrestricted; but any Act of the Parliament of Canada making Provision for such Uniformity shall not have effect in any Province unless and until it is adopted and enacted as Law by the Legislature thereof.

94A. The Parliament of Canada may make laws in relation to old age pensions and supplementary benefits,

including survivors' and disability benefits irrespective of age, but no such law shall affect the operation of any law present or future of a provincial legislature in relation to any such matter.

[NOTE: Substituted by the *British North America Act, 1964, 12-13 Eliz. II, c. 73 (U.K.)* for section 94A which was originally added by the *British North America Act, 1951, 14-15 Geo. VI, c. 32 (U.K.)*.]

Agriculture and Immigration

95. In each Province the Legislature may make Laws in relation to Agriculture in the Province, and to Immigration into the Province; and it is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may from Time to Time make Laws in relation to Agriculture in all or any of the Provinces, and to Immigration into all or any of the Provinces; and any Law of the Legislature of a Province relative to Agriculture or to Immigration shall have effect in and for the Province as long and as far only as it is not repugnant to any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

121. All Articles of the Growth, Produce, or Manufacture of any one of the Provinces shall, from and after the Union, be admitted free into each of the other Provinces.

132. The Parliament and Government of Canada shall have all Powers necessary or proper for performing the Obligations of Canada or of any Province thereof, as Part of the British Empire, towards Foreign Countries, arising under Treaties between the Empire and such Foreign Countries.

133. Either the English or the French Language may be used by any Person in the Debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those Languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those Languages may be used by any Person or in any Pleading or Process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the Courts of Quebec.

The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those Languages.

APPENDIX B

Canadian Constitutional Charter

Constitutional Conference, Victoria, June 14-16, 1971

PART I—POLITICAL RIGHTS

Art. 1. It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada every person has the following fundamental freedoms:

freedom of thought, conscience and religion,
freedom of opinion and expression, and
freedom of peaceful assembly and of association;

and all laws shall be construed and applied so as not to abrogate or abridge any such freedom.

Art. 2. No law of the Parliament of Canada or the Legislatures of the Provinces shall abrogate or abridge any of the fundamental freedoms herein recognized and declared.

Art. 3. Nothing in this Part shall be construed as preventing such limitations on the exercise of the fundamental freedoms as are reasonably justifiable in a democratic society in the interests of public safety, order, health or morals, of national security, or of the rights and freedoms of others, whether imposed by the Parliament of Canada or the Legislature of a Province, within the limits of their respective legislative powers, or by the construction or application of any law.

Art. 4. The principles of universal suffrage and free democratic elections to the House of Commons and to the Legislative Assembly of each Province are hereby proclaimed to be fundamental principles of the Constitution.

Art. 5. No citizen shall, by reason of race, ethnic or national origin, colour, religion or sex, be denied the right to vote in an election of members to the House of Commons or the Legislative Assembly of a Province, or be disqualified from membership therein.

Art. 6. Every House of Commons shall continue for five years from the day of the return of the writs for choosing the House and no longer subject to being sooner dissolved by the Governor General, except that in time of real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection, a House of Commons may be continued by the Parliament of Canada if the continuation is not opposed by the votes of more than one-third of the members of the House.

Art. 7. Every Provincial Legislative Assembly shall continue for five years from the day of the return of the writs for the choosing of the Legislative Assembly, and no longer, subject to being sooner dissolved by the Lieutenant-Governor, except that when the Government of Canada declares that a state of real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection exists, a Provincial Legislative Assembly may be continued if the continuation is not opposed by the votes of more than one-third of the members of the Legislative Assembly.

Art. 8. There shall be a session of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of each Province at least once in every year, so that twelve months shall not intervene between the last sitting of the Parliament or Legislature in one session and its first sitting in the next session.

Art. 9. Nothing in this Part shall be deemed to confer any legislative power on the Parliament of Canada or the Legislature of any Province.

PART II—LANGUAGE RIGHTS

Art. 10. English and French are the official languages of Canada having the status and protection set forth in this Part.

Art. 11. A person has the right to use English and French in the debates of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislatures of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland.

Art. 12. The statutes and the records and journals of the Parliament of Canada shall be printed and published in English and French, and both versions of such statutes shall be authoritative.

Art. 13. The statutes of each Province shall be printed and published in English and French, and where the Government of a Province, prints and publishes its statutes in one only of the official languages, the Government of Canada shall print and publish them in the other official language; the English and French versions of the statutes of the Provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Newfoundland shall be authoritative.

Art. 14. A person has the right to use English and French in giving evidence before, or in any pleading or process in the Supreme Court of Canada, any courts established by the Parliament of Canada or any court of the Provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Newfoundland, and to require that all documents and judgments issuing from such courts be in English or French, and when necessary a person is entitled to the services of an interpreter before the courts of other provinces.

Art. 15. An individual has the right to the use of the official language of his choice in communications between him and the head or central office of every department and agency of the Government of Canada and of the governments of the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland.

Art. 16. A Provincial Legislative Assembly may, by resolution, declare that any part of Articles 13, 14, and 15 that do not expressly apply to that Province shall apply to the Legislative Assembly, and to any of the provincial courts and offices of the provincial departments and agencies according to the terms of the resolution, and thereafter such parts shall apply to the Legislative Assembly, courts and offices specified according to the terms of the resolution; and any right conferred under this Article may be abrogated or diminished only in accordance with the procedure prescribed in Article 50.

Art. 17. A person has the right to the use of the official language of his choice in communications between him and every principal office of the departments and agencies of the Government of Canada that are located in an area where a substantial proportion of the population has the official language of his choice as its mother tongue, but the Parliament of Canada may define the limits of

such areas and what constitutes a substantial proportion of the population for the purposes of this Article.

Art. 18. In addition to the rights provided by this Part, the Parliament of Canada and the Legislatures of the Provinces may, within their respective legislative jurisdictions, provide for more extensive use of English and French.

Art. 19. Nothing in this Part shall be construed as derogating from or diminishing any legal or customary right or privilege acquired or enjoyed either before or after the coming into force of this Part with respect to any language that is not English or French.

PART III—PROVINCES AND TERRITORIES

Art. 20. Until modified under the authority of the Constitution of Canada, Canada consists of ten Provinces, named Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Newfoundland, two Territories, named the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, and such other territory as may at any time form part of Canada.

Art. 21. There shall be a Legislature for each Province consisting of a Lieutenant-Governor and a Legislative Assembly.

PART IV—SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

Art. 22. There shall be a general court of appeal for Canada to be known as the Supreme Court of Canada.

Art. 23. The Supreme Court of Canada shall consist of a chief justice to be called the Chief Justice of Canada, and eight other judges who shall, subject to this Part, be appointed by the Governor General in Council by letters patent under the Great Seal of Canada.

Art. 24. Any person may be appointed a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada who, after having been admitted to the Bar of any Province, has, for a total period of at least ten years, been a judge of any court in Canada or a barrister or advocate at the Bar of any Province.

Art. 25. At least three of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada shall be appointed from among persons who, after having been admitted to the Bar of the Province of Quebec, have, for a total period of at least ten years, been judges of any court of that Province or of a court established by the Parliament of Canada or barristers or advocates at that Bar.

Art. 26. Where a vacancy arises in the Supreme Court of Canada and the Attorney General of Canada is considering a person for appointment to fill the vacancy, he shall inform the Attorney General of the appropriate Province.

Art. 27. When an appointment is one falling within Article 25 or the Attorney General of Canada has determined that the appointment shall be made from among persons who have been admitted to the Bar of a specific Province, he shall make all reasonable efforts to reach agreement with the Attorney General of the appropriate Province, before a person is appointed to the Court.

Art. 28. No person shall be appointed to the Supreme Court of Canada unless the Attorney General of Canada and the Attorney General of the appropriate Province agree to the appointment, or such person has been recommended for appointment to the Court by a nominating council described in Article 30, or has been selected by the Attorney General of Canada under Article 30.

Art. 29. Where after the lapse of ninety days from the day a vacancy arises in the Supreme Court of Canada, the Attorney General of Canada and the Attorney General of a Province have not reached agreement on a person to be

appointed to fill the vacancy, the Attorney General of Canada may inform the Attorney General of the appropriate Province in writing that he proposes to convene a nominating council to recommend an appointment.

Art. 30. Within thirty days of the day when the Attorney General of Canada has written the Attorney General of the Province that he proposes to convene a nominating council, the Attorney General of the Province may inform the Attorney General of Canada in writing that he selects either of the following types of nominating councils:

(1) a nominating council consisting of the following members: the Attorney General of Canada or his nominee and the Attorneys General of the Provinces or their nominees;

(2) a nominating council consisting of the following members: the Attorney General of Canada or his nominee, the Attorney General of the appropriate Province or his nominee and a Chairman to be selected by the two Attorneys General, and if within six months from the expiration of the thirty days they cannot agree on a Chairman, then the Chief Justice of the appropriate Province, or if he is unable to act, the next senior Judge of his court, shall name a Chairman;

and if the Attorney General of the Province fails to make a selection within the thirty days above referred to, the Attorney General of Canada may select the person to be appointed.

Art. 31. When a nominating council has been created, the Attorney General of Canada shall submit the names of not less than three qualified persons to it about whom he has sought the agreement of the Attorney General of the appropriate Province to the appointment, and the nominating council shall recommend therefrom a person for appointment to the Supreme Court of Canada; a majority of the members of a council constitutes a quorum, and a recommendation of the majority of the members at a meeting constitutes a recommendation of the council.

Art. 32. For the purpose of Articles 26 to 31 "appropriate Province" means, in the case of a person being considered for appointment to the Supreme Court of Canada in compliance with Article 25, the Province of Quebec, and in the case of any other person being so considered, the Province to the bar of which such person was admitted, and if a person was admitted to the bar of more than one Province, the Province with the bar of which the person has, in the opinion of the Attorney General of Canada, the closest connection.

Art. 33. Articles 26 to 32 do not apply to the appointment of the Chief Justice of Canada when such appointment is made from among the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Art. 34. The judges of the Supreme Court of Canada hold office during good behaviour until attaining the age of seventy years, but are removable by the Governor General on address of the Senate and House of Commons.

Art. 35. The Supreme Court of Canada has jurisdiction to hear and determine appeals on any constitutional question from any judgment of any court in Canada and from any decision on any constitutional question by any such court in determining any question referred to it, but except as regards appeals from the highest court of final resort in a Province, the Supreme Court of Canada may prescribe such exceptions and conditions to the exercise of such jurisdiction as may be authorized by the Parliament of Canada.

Art. 36. Subject to this Part, the Supreme Court of Canada shall have such further appellate jurisdiction as the Parliament of Canada may prescribe.

Art. 37. The Parliament of Canada may make laws conferring original jurisdiction on the Supreme Court of Canada in respect of such matters in relation of the laws of Canada as may be prescribed by the Parliament of Canada, and authorizing the reference of questions of law or fact to the court and requiring the court to hear and determine the questions.

Art. 38. Subject to this Part, the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada in all cases is final and conclusive.

Art. 39. Where a case before the Supreme Court of Canada involves questions of law relating to the civil law of the Province of Quebec, and involves no other question of law, it shall be heard by a panel of five judges, or with the consent of the parties, four judges, at least three of whom have the qualifications described in Article 25, and if for any reason three judges of the court who have such qualifications are not available, the court may name such *ad hoc* judges as may be necessary to hear the case from among the judges who have such qualifications serving on a superior court of record established by the law of Canada or of a superior court of appeal of the Province of Quebec.

Art. 40. Nothing in this Part shall be construed as restricting the power existing at the commencement of this Charter of a Provincial Legislature to provide for or limit appeals pursuant to its power to legislate in relation to the administration of justice in the Province.

Art. 41. The salaries, allowances and pensions of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada shall be fixed and provided by the Parliament of Canada.

Art. 42. Subject to this Part, the Parliament of Canada may make laws to provide for the organization and maintenance of the Supreme Court of Canada, including the establishment of a quorum for particular purposes.

PART V—COURTS OF CANADA

Art. 43. The Parliament of Canada may, notwithstanding anything in the Constitution of Canada, from time to time provide for the constitution, maintenance, and organization of courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada, but no court established pursuant to this Article shall derogate from the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Canada as a general court of appeal for Canada.

PART VI—REVISED SECTION 94A

Art. 44. The Parliament of Canada may make laws in relation to old age pensions and supplementary benefits including survivors' and disability benefits irrespective of age, and in relation to family, youth, and occupational training allowances, but no such law shall affect the operation of any law present or future of a Provincial Legislature in relation to any such matter.

Art. 45. The Government of Canada shall not introduce a bill in the House of Commons in relation to a matter described in Article 44 unless it has, at least ninety days before such introduction, advised the government of each Province of the substance of the proposed legislation and requested its views thereon.

PART VII—REGIONAL DISPARITIES

Art. 46. The Parliament and Government of Canada and the Legislatures and Governments of the Provinces are committed to:

- (1) the promotion of equality of opportunity and well being for all individuals in Canada;

- (2) the assurance, as nearly as possible, that essential public services of reasonable quality are available to all individuals in Canada; and

- (3) the promotion of economic development to reduce disparities in the social and economic opportunities for all individuals in Canada wherever they may live.

Art. 47. The provisions of this Part shall not have the effect of altering the distribution of powers and shall not compel the Parliament of Canada or Legislatures of the Provinces to exercise their legislative powers.

PART VIII—FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONSULTATION

Art. 48. A Conference composed of the Prime Minister of Canada and the First Ministers of the Provinces shall be called by the Prime Minister of Canada at least once a year unless, in any year, a majority of those composing the Conference decide that it shall not be held.

PART IX—AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Art. 49. Amendments to the Constitution of Canada may from time to time be made by proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada when so authorized by resolutions of the Senate and House of Commons and of the Legislative Assemblies of at least a majority of the Provinces that includes

- (1) every Province that at any time before the issue of such proclamation had, according to any previous general census, a population of at least twenty-five percent of the population of Canada;

- (2) at least two of the Atlantic Provinces;

- (3) at least two of the Western Provinces that have, according to the then latest general census, combined populations of at least fifty per cent of the population of all the Western Provinces.

Art. 50. Amendments to the Constitution of Canada in relation to any provision that applies to one or more, but not all, of the Provinces may from time to time be made by proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada when so authorized by resolutions of the Senate and House of Commons and of the Legislative Assembly of each Province to which an amendment applies.

Art. 51. An amendment may be made by proclamation under Article 49 or 50 without a resolution of the Senate authorizing the issue of the proclamation if within ninety days of the passage of a resolution by the House of Commons authorizing its issue the Senate has not passed such a resolution and at any time after the expiration of the ninety days the House of Commons again passes the resolution, but any period when Parliament is prorogued or dissolved shall not be counted in computing the ninety days.

Art. 52. The following rules apply to the procedures for amendment described in Articles 49 and 50:

- (1) either of these procedures may be initiated by the Senate or the House of Commons or the Legislative Assembly of a Province;
- (2) a resolution made for the purposes of this Part may be revoked at any time before the issue of a proclamation authorized by it.

Art. 53. The Parliament of Canada may exclusively make laws from time to time amending the Constitution of Canada, in relation to the executive Government of Canada and the Senate and House of Commons.

Art. 54. In each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to the amendment from time to time of the Constitution of the Province.

Art. 55. Notwithstanding Articles 53 and 54, the following matters may be amended only in accordance with the procedure in Article 49:

- (1) the office of the Queen, of the Governor General and of the Lieutenant-Governor;
- (2) the requirements of the Constitution of Canada respecting yearly sessions of the Parliament of Canada and the Legislatures;
- (3) the maximum period fixed by the Constitution of Canada for the duration of the House of Commons and the Legislative Assemblies;
- (4) the powers of the Senate;
- (5) the number of members by which a Province is entitled to be represented in the Senate and the residence qualifications of Senators;
- (6) the right of a Province to a number of members in the House of Commons not less than the number of Senators representing the Province;
- (7) the principles of proportionate representation of the Provinces in the House of Commons prescribed by the Constitution of Canada; and
- (8) except as provided in Article 16, the requirements of this Charter respecting the use of the English or French language.

Art. 56. The procedure prescribed in Article 49 may not be used to make an amendment when there is another provision for making such amendment in the Constitution of Canada, but that procedure may nonetheless be used to amend any provision for amending the Constitution, including this Article, or in making a general consolidation and revision of the Constitution.

Art. 57. In this Part, "Atlantic Provinces" means the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, and "Western Provinces" means the Provinces of Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

PART X—MODERNIZATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

Art. 58. The provisions of this Charter have the force of law in Canada notwithstanding any law in force on the day of its coming into force.

Art. 59. The enactments set out in the first column of the Schedule, hereby repealed to the extent indicated in the second column thereof, shall continue as law in Canada under the names set forth in the third column thereof and as such shall, together with this Charter, collectively be known as the Constitution of Canada, and amendments thereto shall henceforth be made only according to the authority contained therein.

Art. 60. Every enactment that refers to an enactment set out in the Schedule by the name in the first column thereof is hereby amended by substituting for that name the name in the third column thereof.

Art. 61. The court existing on the day of the coming into force of this Charter under the name of the Supreme Court of Canada shall continue as the Supreme Court of Canada, and the judges thereof shall continue in office as though appointed under Part IV except that they shall hold office during good behaviour until attaining the age of seventy-five years, and until otherwise provided pursuant to the provisions of that Part, all laws pertaining to the court in force on that day shall continue, subject to the provisions of this Charter:

THIS SCHEDULE IS NOT FINAL, SUBJECT TO CONFIRMATION

Enactments	Extent of Repeal	New Name	Enactments	Extent of Repeal	New Name
British North America Act, 1867, 30-31 Vict., c. 3 (U.K.).	Long title; preamble; the heading immediately preceding section 1; sections 1, 5, the words between brackets in section 12; sections 19, 20, 37, 40, 41, 47, 50, the words "and to Her Majesty's Instructions" and the words "or that he reserves the Bill for the Signification of the Queen's Pleasure" in section 55; sections 56, 57, 63; the words between brackets in section 65; sections 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 83, 84, 85, 86; the words "the Disallowance of Acts, and the Signification of Pleasure on Bills reserved" and the words "of the Governor General for the Queen and for a Secretary of State, of One Year for Two Years, and of the Province for Canada" in section 90; head (1) of section 91; head (1) of section 92; 94A; sections 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 119, 120, 122, 123; the words between brackets in section 129; sections 130, 134, 141, 142; the heading immediately preceding section 146; sections 146, 147; the First Schedule; the Second Schedule.	Constitution Act, 1867.	An Act to amend and continue the Act 32 and 33 Victoria chapter 3; and to establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Manitoba, 1870, 33 Vict., c. 3 (Can.).	Long title; Enacting clause; sections 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25.	Manitoba Act, 1970.
			Order of Her Majesty in Council admitting British Columbia into the Union, dated the 16th day of May 1871.	The whole except terms 4, 9, 10, 13, 14 in the Schedule.	British Columbia Terms of Union
			British North America Act, 1871, 34-35 Vict., c. 28 (U.K.), and all acts enacted under section 3 thereof.	Long title; Preamble, enacting clause; sections 1, 6.	Constitution Act, 1871.
			Order of Her Majesty in Council admitting Prince Edward Island into the Union, dated the 26th day of June, 1873.	The whole, except the conditions in the schedule relating to the provision of steam service and telegraphic communication between the Island and the mainland, the condition respecting the constitution of the executive authority and the Legislature of the province, and the condition applying the British North America Act, 1867 to the province.	Prince Edward Island Terms of Union

THIS SCHEDULE IS NOT FINAL, SUBJECT TO CONFIRMATION—*Concluded*

Enactments	Extent of Repeal	New Name	Enactments	Extent of Repeal	New Name
Parliament of Canada Act, 1875, 38-39 Vict., c. 38 (U.K.).	Long title; Preamble, enacting clause.	Parliament of Canada Act, 1875.	Statute of Westminster, 1931, 22 Geo. V, c. 4 (U.K.). insofar as it applies to Canada.	Long title; the words "and Newfoundland" in sections 1 and 10(3); section 4 insofar as it applies to Canada; section 7(1).	Statute of Westminster, 1931.
Order of Her Majesty in Council admitting all British possessions and Territories in North America and islands adjacent thereto into the Union, dated the 31st day of July, 1880.	The whole, except the last paragraph.	Adjacent Territories Order.	British North America Act, 1940, 3-4 Geo. VI, c. 36 (U.K.).	Long title; preamble, enacting clause, section 2.	Constitution Act, 1940.
British North America Act, 1886, 49-50 Vict., c. 35 (U.K.).	Long title; section 3.	Constitution Act, 1886	British North America Act, 1943, 7 Geo. VI, c. 30 (U.K.).	The whole.	
Canada (Ontario Boundary) Act, 1889, 52-53 Vict., c. 28 (U.K.).	Long title; preamble; enacting clause.	Canada (Ontario Boundary) Act, 1889.	British North America Act, 1946, 10 Geo. VI, c. 63 (U.K.).	Long title; preamble, enacting clause, section 2.	Constitution Act, 1946.
Canadian Speaker (Appointment of Deputy) Act, 1895, Session 2, 59 Vict., c. 3 (U.K.).	Long title; preamble, enacting clause, Section 2.	Canadian Speaker (Appointment of Deputy) Act, 1895.	British North America Act, 1949, 12 and 13 Geo. VI, c. 22 (U.K.).	Long title; third paragraph in preamble; enacting clause; sections 2, 3; terms 6(2), (3), 15(2), 16, 22(2), (4), 24, 27, 28, 29 in the Schedule.	Constitution Act, 1949.
Alberta Act, 1905, 4-5 Edw. VII, c. 3 (Can.).	Long title; enacting clause, sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16(2), 18, 19, 20, Schedule.	Alberta Act.	British North America (No. 2) Act, 1949 (U.K.). 13 Geo. VI, C. 81 (U.K.).	The whole	
Saskatchewan Act, 1905, 4-5 Edw. VII, c. 42 (Can.).	Long title; enacting clause; sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16(2), 18, 19, 20, Schedule.	Saskatchewan Act.	British North America Act, R.S.C., 1952, c. 304 (Can.).	Section 2.	Constitution Act, 1952.
British North America Act, 1907, 7 Edw. VII, c. 11 (U.K.).	Long title; preamble, enacting clause, section 2, Schedule.	Constitution Act, 1907.	British North America Act, 1960, 9 Eliz. II, c. 2 (U.K.).	Long title; preamble; enacting clause; sections 2, 3.	Constitution Act, 1960.
British North America Act, 1915, 5-6 Geo. V, c. 45 (U.K.).	Long title; enacting clause, section 3.	Constitution Act, 1915.	British North America Act, 1964, 12 and 13, Eliz. II, c. 73 (U.K.).	Long title; enacting clause; section 2.	Constitution Act, 1964.
British North America Act, 1930, 20-21 Geo. V, c. 26 (U.K.).	Long title; fourth paragraph of preamble, enacting clause, section 3.	Constitution Act, 1930.	British North America Act, 1965, 14 Eliz. II, c. 4, Part I, (Can.).	Section 2.	Constitution Act, 1965.

APPENDIX C

Extracts from the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Volume III, p. 560.

42. We recommend that in the private sector in Quebec, governments and industry adopt the objective that French become the principal language of work at all levels, and that in pursuit of this objective the following principles be accepted: a) that French be the principal language of work in the major work institutions of the province; b) that, consequently, the majority of work units in such firms that until now have used English as the principal language of work in middle and upper levels become French-language units; and that such firms designate all management and senior positions as posts that require bilingual incumbents; c) that the majority of smaller or specialized firms should use French as their language of work, but that there should be a place for firms where the language of work is English, as there should be a place anywhere in Canada for such firms where the language of work is French; and d) that the main language of work in activities related to operations outside the province remain the choice of the enterprise.

43. We recommend that in the private sector throughout Canada, the Canadian head offices of firms with extensive markets or facilities inside Quebec develop appropriate bilingual capacities, including French-language units and bilingual senior executives.

44. We recommend that the government of Quebec establish a task force to consist of representatives of government, industry, the universities, and the major labour unions with the following general terms of reference: a) to launch discussions with the major companies in the province concerning the current state of bilingualism and biculturalism in their organizations and the means of developing institutional bilingualism more fully; b) to design an overall plan for establishing French as the principal language of work in Quebec and to set a timetable for this process; c) to initiate discussions with the federal government and with the governments of New Brunswick and Ontario, to discover areas of potential co-operation in implementing the plan; and d) to make recommendations to the provincial government for the achievement of the goal and for the establishment of permanent machinery of co-ordination.

45. We recommend that the government of New Brunswick establish a task force charged with suggesting steps to be taken in education, in the provincial public service, and in the private sector so that French can become a language of work like English, bearing in mind the economic and social conditions in the province.

46. We recommend that the government of Ontario establish a task force charged with preparing a programme of action with the objective of ensuring the progressive introduction of French as a language of work in enterprises in bilingual districts, on the basis of a co-operative and concerted effort by government and industry.

47. We recommend that the firms at issue in Recommendations 42 and 43 make an explicit policy commitment to establish institutional bilingualism in their operations;

and that they immediately designate certain units within their head offices and their operations in Quebec, and in bilingual districts, as future French-language units and designate those executive and senior positions that in the near future will require bilingual incumbents.

48. We recommend that, immediately after designating French-language units in their organizations, the firms also designate a substantial number of professional, technical, and managerial positions as French-language posts.

49. We recommend that the firms make every effort to interest Francophone students on business careers, by providing full information in career opportunities to the appropriate officials in French-language educational institutions and by sending recruiting teams to these institutions both within and outside Quebec.

50. We recommend that the firms make their internal training programmes fully available in the French language for their Francophone employees.

51. We recommend that, where internal training programmes are presently unavailable in French, the firms consult with French-language institutions of higher education in Canada and elsewhere about the possibilities of providing the needed programmes.

52. We recommend that the firms seek to equalize the opportunities for job transfers for their Francophone employees, while at the same time taking steps to minimize the difficulties that these transfers entail.

53. We recommend that all material relevant to the promotion process and the preparation for it be made fully available in French.

54. We recommend that all Francophone candidates have the option of expressing themselves in their own language in all oral and written examinations and interviews, and that the examiners take into account the difficulties that the candidate may have had to face during his previous work experience as a result of the obligation to work in a second language.

55. We recommend that where firms designate positions as bilingual posts they take steps to ensure that the required level of competence in French and English is clearly defined and that they use this factor as a criterion in promotions to these positions.

56. We recommend that all information relevant to federal government contracts and other services to private enterprise, including technical specifications and documents, be made available simultaneously in French and English, and that in all official relations among federal government personnel, business firms, and unions, appropriate action be taken to ensure that the French language is fully used in the appropriate circumstances.

57. We recommend that, as a matter of policy, the federal agencies concerned make available to private firms all the data arising from developments in translation services, bilingual lexicons, and language training that may be of assistance to the firms in their transformation process.

APPENDIX D

List of Witnesses who appeared before the Committee showing the Session and Issue in which their Evidence appears.

Session: Issue	Session: Issue	Session: Issue
Abel, Albert 3:19	Association canadienne-française de l'Alberta 3:85	Association des étudiants ukrainiens du Canada 3:19
Action League for Physically Handicapped Advancement . 3:62	Boucher, Jacques	Bandera, Andrew
Owen, William	Association culturelle franco-canadienne de la Saskatchewan 3:11	Fedchun, Gerry
Adam, J. 3:87	Lalonde, Roger	Kucharyshyn, Marusia
Adamson, Agar 3:2	Rottiers, René	Association des Indiens du Québec 3:88
Adler, Leo 3:19 & 3:21	Association de la jeunesse ukrainienne du Canada 3:61	Hill, George
Alain, Viateur 3:65	Nakoneczny, Richard	Plourde, Nora
Albert, Daniel 3:70	Association démocratique italo-canadienne, Toronto 3:62	Association des libertés civiles de la Colombie-Britannique 3:26
Alberta School Trustees Association 3:84	Mastrangelo, Rocco	Hird, Lynda
Martini, Catherine	Association des administrateurs d'école du Québec (Section de la Rive Sud) 3:73	Stanton, John
Alexander, Wayne 3:29	Fransham, J. H.	Association des libertés civiles de Regina 3:11
Allan, Mervyn 3:63	Association des commissaires d'écoles catholiques de la Colombie-Britannique 3:30	Beke, John
Allen, C. D. 2:7	Van Adrichem, M. C. J.	Association des Nations Unies 3:14
Alliance for Life 3:57	Association des commissaires d'écoles de la Saskatchewan 3:12	Williams, Colwyn D.
Cooper, Mary	Dunbar, Frederick L.	Association des Nations Unies au Canada 3:72
Lapointe, Marielle	Association des commissaires des écoles publiques catholiques du diocèse de Kamloops 3:31	Bazar, Bernard
Lusignan, Joan	Beesley, J. F. B.	(Mrs./Mme)
Alliance pour la Vie 3:57	Association des commissaires d'écoles de la Colombie-Britannique 3:27	Association des progressistes-conservateurs de Rivière-la-Paix-Prince-George 3:30
Cooper, Mary	Powell, P. C. D.	Rankle, Peter
Lapointe, Marielle	Association des éleveurs de bétail de la Colombie-Britannique 3:31	Association des travailleurs sociaux, division du Nord de la Colombie-Britannique ... 3:30
Lusignan, Joan	Guichon, Gérard	Dallamore, Vern
Allnutt, JoAnn 3:27	Pilling, Ron	Association des universités et collèges du Canada 3:51
Alpha Omega Ukrainian Students Club University of British Columbia 3:29	Woolliams, Neil E.	Andrew, G. C.
Semotiuk, Andrew	Association des enseignants des Territoires du Nord-ouest ... 3:86	Dunton, A. Davidson
Anderson, Andrew 3:32	Jenkins, Robert	Guindon, Roger
Anderson, F. L. P. 3:28	Association des enseignants du district de Kamloops 3:31	Association du Barreau canadien, subdivision albertaine de la section du droit constitutionnel et international .. 3:84
Andres, Peter G. 3:30	Phillips, A. M.	McDonald, David C.
Andrews, Bruce 3:27	Association des enseignants francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick 3:80	Association esquimo-indienne du Canada 3:76
Angell, Joseph E. 3:30	Desjardins, Gérard	Gupta, Ram K.
Angers, Philippe 3:68 & 3:69	Richard, Jean	Association for Reform in Education 3:69
Angevine, Donald 3:22	Association des étudiants de la Saskatchewan 3:14	Smith, Allane Reid
Ansine, Glen 2:12	Brown, Larry	Trasler, Ian
Archibald, Clinton 3:67		Association libérale de Toronto et de la région (Comité des néo-canadiens) 3:61
Arès, Richard 3:42		Gilbart, John
Argall, Jacqueline 3:54		Association libérale du district de Toronto 3:19
Armstrong, Irwin 2:16		McLaughlin, Claire
Armstrong, Jack 3:14		
Arnold, J. R. 3:29		
Arundel, Anthony 3:26		
Asselin, Célia J. 3:86		
Association anglaise de l'instruction catholique de l'Ontario 3:92		
Brisbois, Edward J.		
Carty, Michael		
Fogarty, P. H.		

Session:Issue	Session:Issue	Session:Issue
Association humaniste du Canada 3:71	Beaudoin, Bernard 3:65	Borgford, Brian 3:11
Morgentaler, Henry	Beaudoin, Gérard A. 3:93	Bot, Mario C. 3:47
Association nationale tchèque du Canada (cellule de Vancouver) 3:29	Beaudoin, T. Moore 3:70	Botiuk, Y. R. 3:19
Drabeck, Jan	Beaudry, Françoise 3:47	Bouchard, Julien 3:66
Schoenbach, Gustav	Beaulieu, Jacques 3:80	Bouchard, Sylvie 3:47
Association of Social Workers, Northern Branch of British Columbia 3:30	Beauvais, Réal 3:57	Boucher, Gaétan 3:65
Dallamore, Vern	Beck, Carl 3:62	Bourassa, Fernand 3:69
Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada 3:51	Beck, Gerry, K. J. 3:85	Bourdege, Oscar 3:34
Andrew, G. C.	Bédard, Jean 3:54	Bourke, Thomas P. 3:22
Dunton, A. Davidson	Bélanger, Armand 3:46	Bourque, Claude 3:4
Guindon, Roger	Belcourt, Rick 3:30	Bousquet, D. 3:70
Association pour la réforme de l'éducation 3:69	Bell, Alfred 3:33	Boutin, Guy 3:53
Smith, Allane Reid	Bell, J. M. 3:85	Bouwman, Roland 3:71
Trasler, Ian	Belleau, Charles 3:57	Bowker, Wilbur F. 3:84
Association pour l'égalité des droits des femmes indiennes Doré, Cecilia Phillips 3:68	Bellware, Fred 3:39	Bowns, Wilfrid 3:32
Association pour le perfectionnement des parents seuls de Regina 3:12	Beltrano, Frank M. 3:47	Boyd, Bert 2:16
Tutt, Sherrie	Belzil, Paul 3:84	Boyd, Maureen 3:27
Association urbaine et municipale de la Saskatchewan .. 3:11	Benedict, Ernest 3:19	Boyd, Stephen 3:4
Murphy, J.	Bennett, M. 3:31	Brack, Bob 3:23
Atkey, Ronald G. 3:9	Benoît, Delphis 3:53	Bradley, Mary 3:57
Atraghi, Edward 3:39	Beresh, Brian 3:11	Bramucci, Norman 3:72
Aubry, Jean-Paul 2:11	Bergeron, Edmond-Louis 3:67	Bremmer, Rusty 2:15
Audet, Sarah 3:72	Bergeron, Gérard 3:74	Brigham, Royden 3:19
Axworthy, A. 3:39	Bernard, Ken 2:8	British Columbia Beef Cattle Growers Association 3:31
& 3:40	Bernier, Madeleine 2:11	Guichon, Gérard
Axworthy, Lloyd 2:9	Bets, John, (Mrs./Mme) 3:79	Pilling, Ron
	Beune, Antony 3:85	Wooliams, Neil E.
	Bevan, George H. 3:19	British Columbia Civil Liberties Association 3:26
	Beveridge, J. M. R. 3:2	Hird, Lynda
	Bhattacharya, B. 3:77	Stanton, John
	Billot, Deloras 3:55	British Columbia School Trustees Association 3:27
	Bilodeau, Michel 3:57	Powell, P. C. D.
	Bilomaa, Barbara 3:46	British-Israel World Federation (Canada) Incorporated 3:29
	Bilsky, Frank 2:17	Brewer, Dawn
	Binder, Ellen 3:87	Brockelbank, John 3:12
	Bird, J. W. 3:78	Broddy, Bill 3:30
	Bishop, Arthur A. 3:33	Broderick, Charles 3:80
	Bishop, Charles 3:31	Brokenshire, J. W. 3:77
	Bissley, Giselle 3:28	Bronfman, Peter, (Mrs./M ^{me}) 3:69
	Bisson, Antonio 3:46	Brown, James 3:22
	Blake, Mary 3:43	Brown, Joyce 3:26
	Blanchard, Thomas 3:19	Brown, Kingsley 3:4
	Block, Gilbert 3:69	Brown-John, Lloyd 3:23
	Board of Evangelism and Social Service, United Church of Canada 3:83	Brown, R. A. C. 2:9
	MacDonald, W. Clarke	Brunet, Henri 3:46
	Stewart, Gordon K.	Bryant, Frank 3:40
	Bobb, Rubin 3:34	Bryce, R. B. 2:6
	Bobitt, Greg 3:11	Buckwold, Sidney, L. 3:14
	Bock, Paul 3:71	Bugeaud, Eugène 3:67
	Boehm, David 3:26	Bureau, Karl 3:20
	Boileau, André 3:40	Burchill, C. S. 3:28
	Boileau, Gérard 3:56	Bureau, Marc 3:53
	Boisvert, Napoléon 3:54	Burgess, Arthur 3:27
	Boivin, Stanley 3:46	Burgess, Rod 3:33
	Bojeun, Mark 3:19	Burnham, George 3:28
	Bolden, William 3:33	Burns, R. M. 3:15
	Bolduc, Yvon 3:54	Burns, Ronald 3:45
	Bolger, Allan 3:69	Burns, Susan 2:14
	Bolton, Kenneth 3:22	Burns, Tom 3:48
	Bonnes, D. W. 3:48	Burnyeat, Grant 3:27
	Bonenfant, Jean-Charles 3:89	
	Bonneau, Lorenzo 3:73	
	Booth, Peter 2:17	

Session:Issue	Session:Issue	Session:Issue
Burridge, E. A., (M ^{me} /Mrs.) .. 3:65	Canadian Ukrainian Committee 2:8	Chaumont, Christine 3:47
Business and Professional	Lynka, Izdiore H.	Chaumont, Gislaine 3:47
Women's Clubs of Alberta 3:84	Swystun, W. M.	Cheffins, Ronald I. 3:28
Armstrong, Ellen C. T.	Syrnyck, John H.	Cheramy, Arthur 3:30
Buteau, Gaston 3:46	Yaremowich, Anthony	Chernenkoff, C. 3:13
Butler, Robert D. 3:34	Canadian Unity, Rights and	Chevrier, Jean 3:72
	Equality 3:69	Chevalier, Jean-Claude 3:55
Cabana, Serge 3:53	Beale, Robert G.	Cheychux, Joan 2:12
Cairnduff, Malcolm 3:62	Candela, Rafael 3:80	Chimen, M. A. 3:19
Caldwell, Jeri Anne 3:23	Canuel, Léonidas 3:66	Chinese/Asian Cultural Asso-
Caledon Contemporaries 3:62	Caplan, Joseph 3:19	ciation of New Brunswick . 3:78
Coles, Stuart		Hum, Gordon
Somerville, Janet	Caragata, Warren 3:11	Chong, Gladys 3:26
Calle, James L. 3:23	Carbonneau, Madeleine 3:70	Chrapko, Metro 3:84
Calver, Marshall 3:22	Carney, Bob 3:11	Chrétien, Hon. Jean, Minister
Cameron, Hugh 3:22	Caron, Roger 3:54	of Indian Affairs and North-
Campbell, Adam 3:85	Carpenter, Marian 3:33	ern Development 3:18
Campbell, Albert 3:19	Carr, Richard (Mrs./Mme) 3:78	Chrétien, l'hon. Jean, Ministre
Campbell, Bryan 2:12	Carricato, Patrick 3:47	des Affaires indiennes et du
Campbell, Dorothy 3:4	Carrière, Paul 3:56	Nord canadien 3:18
Campbell, Douglas 3:62	Casey, Kenneth 3:71	Christie, Terry 3:78
Campbell, Maureen 2:10	Catholic School Trustees' As-	Christy, Gil 3:62
Campbell, R. A. 3:2	sociation of British Columbia 3:30	Church, John 3:22
Canada Committee 3:68	Van Adrichem, M. C. J.	Citizenship and Legislative
Lemay, Henri-Paul	Cavarzan, John 3:23	Committee of Local 444
Malcolm, T. R. Anthony	Chamberland, Claude 3:53	U.A.W. (Windsor) 3:23
Canada Press Club 2:8	Chamberlist, Norman 2:15	McNamara, Pat
Dojack, Charles		Clark, Anne 3:30
Roeder, Hans-Hermann	Chambre de commerce de Ké-	Clark, Elaine 3:2
Canada Uni, Respect et Égalité 3:69	nogami, (Qué.) 3:67	Clark, Glenn 3:30
Beale, Robert G.	Turcotte, Jean-Jacques	Clarke, David 3:31
Canadian Bar Association, Al-	Chambre de commerce de Leth-	Clarke, Luther 3:23
berta Subsection, Section on	bridge, (Alberta) 3:32	Clarkson, Stephen 3:19
Constitutional and Interna-	Bond, W.	Clermont, Jean Bernard 3:70
tional Law 3:84	Tanner, Morley	Clermont, Jean 3:68
McDonald, David C.	Chambre de commerce de Ma-	Cloutier, Denis 3:55
Canadian Federation of Busi-	grath, (Alberta) 3:32	Club Alpha Amega des étu-
ness and Professional	Spencer, J. A.	dians ukrainiens, Université
Women's Clubs 3:72	Chambre de commerce de Re-	de la Colombie-Britannique 3:29
VanDine, Charlotte I.	gina, (Sask.) 3:11	Semotiuk, Andrew
Canadian-German Group 3:73	McLeod, R. A.	Club ukrainien de l'Université
Wiss, Jules	Chambre de commerce régio-	Western Ontario, London,
Canadian League for Ukraine's	nale du Saguenay, (Qué.) .. 3:67	Ont. 3:22
Liberation (Toronto Branch)	Lavoie, Jean	Dubas, O.
(section de Toronto) 3:61	Chambre de commerce de	Clubs de Femmes de carrières
Shymko, Yuri	Thompson, (Man.) 2:12	libérales et commerciales de
Canadian League of Rights,	Johnston, B.	l'Alberta 3:84
Manitoba Branch 2:10	Chambre de commerce de	Armstrong, Ellen, C. T. ..
Belows, J. H.	Trois-Rivières, (Qué.) 3:53	Cochrane, John 2:10
Walsh, Patrick	Chevrette, Lucien	Cohen, Lotte 3:34
Canadian Loyalists Association 3:39	Chambre de commerce de	Cohen, Maxwell 3:92
Crawford, Stewart	Whitehorse, (Territoire du	Coles, Geoffrey 3:86
Leguerrier, René	Yukon) 2:16	Coles, Stuart 3:19
Yarymowich, B.	Chandler, John G. 3:22	Colle, Philippe 3:53
Canadian School Trustees As-	Chandler, Sharon 3:22	Collins, Michael 3:26
sociation 3:85	Chapitre national du Canada	Collins, Richard 3:48
Reder, F. M.	de l'I.O.D.E. 3:62	Comartin, Joe 3:23
Smedley, J. V.	Morrison, W. R. (Mrs./	Comeau, Léger 3:1
Whitney, C. H.	M ^{me})	Comité Canada 3:68
Canadian Teachers' Federa-	Tait, George E. (Mrs./	Comité canadien des
tion 3:37	M ^{me})	Ukrainiens (Toronto) 3:19
Fieger, Peter P.	Charbonneau, V. 3:29	Comité jeunesse Canada, Bur-
Fredericks, Rod G.	Charman, Eric 3:28	naby, Colombie-Britannique 3:27
Sparkes, Wendell J.	Chartrand, R. 3:70	Bishop, Robert
Goble, Norman M.	Chateauneuf, Denis 3:72	Hughes, Robert

Session: Issue	Session: Issue	Session: Issue
Comité de Toronto du droit à la vie 3:62	Communist Party of Canada, Manitoba Provincial Committee 2:11	Cottonwood Island Residents Association 3:30
Fish, Belvia	Ross, William	Mossman, Lucille
Hezewyk, B. Van	Communist Party of Canada, Metropolitan Toronto Committee 3:62	Coulombe, Jean-Maurice 3:67
Landolt, Gwendolyn	Massie, Gordon	Coupal, Ed 3:46
Morris, Heather	Communist Party of Quebec .. 3:81	Cousins, Brian 3:87
Vennir, W. G.	Walsh, Samuel J.	Craik, Robert L. 3:28
Comité des Canadiens-Ukrainiens 2:8	Confédération des résidents et des contribuables 3:19	Cramer, Jack 3:56
Lynka, Izdiore H.	Hayes, Derek	Cranley, W. J. 3:32
Swystun, W. M.	Confederation of Resident and Ratepayer Associations .. 3:19	Crawford, Louise 3:31
Syrnyck, John H.	Hayes, Derek	Creery, R. A. 2:17
Yaremowich, Anthony	Congrès canadien polonais ... 3:72	Creighton, Donald G. 3:64
Comité des citoyens francophones de Sudbury et la région 3:46	Kawaczak, Andrew	Crinem, Ray 3:33
Beauchamp, Rhéal	Romer, Tadeusz	Crosbie, Patricia 3:28
Comité du Parti communiste du Canada pour la ville de Toronto 3:62	Connaughton, Graham, W. 3:23	Cuddihy, Paul E. 3:4
Massie, Gordon	Conrad, James 3:20	Current Affairs Workshop Education Committee, Parish Council of the Annunciation
Comité législatif, Conseil du travail de la région de Windsor 3:23	Conseil d'administration de la société Saint-Jean Baptiste diocésaine de Rimouski 3:66	Comité de la Paroisse Annonciation 3:73
Batterson, Les	Daigneault, René	Paz, Pamela
Comité municipal conjoint sur les relations intergouvernementales 3:50	Conseil de l'évangélisme et de service social, Église unie du Canada 3:83	Currie, Don W. 3:30
Burns, R. M.	MacDonald, W. Clarke	Cyr, Daniel 3:67
D'Amour, M.	Stewart, Gordon K.	Cyr, Jean-Marc 3:53
Dent, I. G.	Conseil de la tribu indienne de Squamish 3:27	Czechoslovak National Association of Canada (Vancouver Chapter) 3:29
Newman, D. G.	Mathias, Joe	Drabek, Jan
O'Brien, A.	Conseil des Associations paroissiales, Notre-Dame-de-Lourdes, Timmins, Ont. 3:56	Schoenbach, Gustav
Comité ukrainien du Canada, section de Montréal 3:73	Maynard, Dominique L.	
Hykawy, J.	Conseil diocésan de Saint-Jean de la ligue des femmes catholiques du Canada 3:78	Daigle, Phil 3:29
Karpishka, Roman B.	McLean, Muriel	Dalaire, Didier 3:72
Commandement provincial du Québec des anciens combattants de l'armée, de la marine et de l'aviation du Canada 3:70	Conseil du travail de Toronto métropolitain 3:61	Dale, Peter 3:1
Fedosen, Phil	Montgomery, D. K.	Dalton, W. J. 3:1
Commission des droits de l'homme du Nouveau-Brunswick 3:78	Conseil national des femmes du Canada 3:74	D'Amour, Marcel 3:57
Kinsella, Noël	Booth, Ann	Dandeneau, Egide 3:57
Commission des écoles séparées du Toronto métropolitain .. 3:92	Steadman, S. F.	Dandurand, Jean-Pierre 3:70
Fullerton, J. A.	Cook, George 3:30	D'Anjou, Guy 3:66
Heenan, C. B.	Cook, Ramsay 3:74	D'Anjou, René 3:65
McDonald, D. F.	Coolican, Denis 3:39	Dansereau, Auguste 2:11
Commission scolaire protestante de Montréal 3:69	Copp, Victor 3:21	Dansereau, Guy 3:54
Tilley, A. Reid	Corbeil, Madeleine 3:72	Dansereau, Jean 3:53
Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement 3:87	Corbett, Donald J. 3:47	Daoust, Paul 3:65
Cournoyea, Nellie	Corbett, F. M. 3:67	David, Bob 3:86
Rubin, Abraham	Corlett, James M. 3:26	Davidson, Murray 3:46
Semmler, Agnes	Corey, Jim 3:34	Davis, H. F. 2:1
Communist Party of Canada, Central Executive Committee 3:81	Corrigan, J. R. 3:39	Davis, R. T. (Mrs./M ^{me}) 3:62
Demers, Claire	Corry, J. A. 3:36	Davis, Trevor, C. M. 3:28
Kashtan, William	Cosgrove, Fred 3:20	Dawkins, Zella 3:56
	Cosgrove, W. J. 3:70	Dawrant, A. Geoffrey 3:85
	Costain, William 3:28	Dawson, George S. 3:28
	Côté, Eva (Mrs./M ^{me}) 3:66	Daykin, H. E. 3:29
	Cotton, Frank 3:32	Dean, Art 3:19
		Decarie, Graham 3:5
		Dechamplain, Jean-Luc 3:66
		Dehler, Ronald 3:43
		de Jong, Renée 3:19
		Delaney, Eileen C. 3:65
		Del Villano, Leo 3:56
		DeMarsh, Roy 3:62
		Demers, Juliette 3:66
		Dennison, William 3:19
		Dent, Ivor G. 3:85

Session: Issue		Session: Issue		Session: Issue	
Deraspe, Raymond	3:90	Paradis, Pierre-Paul	3:66	Federation of Independent	
Desrosiers, Lawrence	3:66	Étudiants du département de		School Associations in British	
Desrosiers, Noël (M ^{me} /Mrs.)	3:66	sciences politiques Université		Columbia	3:27
Destonaus, Margaret	3:70	de Lethbridge	3:32	Waller, J. F.	
Dewar, Barry	3:2	Runge, Ken		Federation of Saskatchewan	
Dewar, George	3:5	Slemko, Brian		Indians	3:14
de Wolf, John	3:29	Evans, Marjorie	3:27	Gordon, Walter	
Dickerson, Mark O.	3:34	Evans, Richard J.	3:23	Fenton, John	3:20
Dickman, Beth	3:28	Evans, Una	3:85	Fenwick, Lawrence	3:19
Dickman, Phil	2:17	Everett, Richard	3:62	Ferguson, D. K.	3:69
Dielschneider, Peter J.	3:13			Ferguson, Howard	3:40
Dion, Léon	3:60				& 3:43
Dion, Robert	3:53	Fabio, Primo	3:48	Fernihough, William	3:67
Dionne, Charles	3:79	Fair, Bill	3:14	Ferris, John	3:47
Dionne, Jean-Marie	3:79	Fakete, Tony	2:16	Fifield, Robert	3:77
Dionne, Jean-Pierre	3:90	Falkenberg, Eugene	3:32	Fillipoff, P.	3:40
Dittrich, Douglas	3:87	Faribault, Marcel	3:58	Fingland, Frank	3:18
Dodd, Cecil	3:33	Faris, Ronald	3:11	Finlay, Frank	3:61
Dodd, Gail	3:33	Faubert, Denis	3:56	Finlay, Norine	3:62
Dodd, J. G.	3:39	Fawzy, Nabil	3:62	Finlayson, D.	3:86
	& 3:40	Fédéralistes mondiaux du		Finlayson, Norman	3:27
Dodson, Robert	3:26	Canada	3:83	Fitch, R. H. (Mrs./Mme)	3:80
Doig, Hugh	3:46	Smyth, Ross		Fitzpatrick, Patrick	3:78
Donahue, Bob	3:85	Fédéralistes mondiaux du		Fletcher, Paula	3:47
Donison, Michael	3:28	Canada (division de		Flis, Henry	3:19
Donnelly, Murray	2:9	Calgary)	3:34	Fogarty, Kenneth	3:39
Drabek, Stan	3:34	Macqueen, R. W.		Fogarty, Brian	3:27
Drapeau, Jean	3:68	Fédéralistes mondiaux du		Fogarty, Stephen	3:69
Duff, Donald J.	3:1	Canada (Montréal)	3:71	Foley, Carl J.	3:30
Duffy, George	3:79	Arnopoulos, P. J.		Forestell, Ray	3:46
Dufour, Anatole	3:67	Fédération balte du Canada		Forget, Roger	3:22
Dufour, Francis	3:67	(section Montréalaise)	3:71	Fortin, Gaétan	3:67
Dugas, Jacqueline	3:70	Freibergs, Vaira		Fortin, Jean-Pierre	3:54
Dumas, Guy	3:45	Fédération canadienne des en-		Fortin, Paul R.	3:70
Dumas, J. Raymond	3:70	seignants	3:37	Fortin, Richard	3:65
Dumont, Robert S.	3:14	Feiger, Peter P.		Foucault, Jules	2:12
Dunn, John	3:46	Fredericks, Rod G.		Fournier, Peter	3:47
Dunne, Patrick B.	3:77	Sparkes, Wendell J.		Fournier, Raymond-Marie	3:67
Dunsmore, Ross	3:45	Goble, Norman M.		Fox, Christie	3:56
Dupuis, Frank	3:65	Fédération canadienne-		Fradsham, Allan A.	3:33
Durocher, Cy	3:91	française de la Colombie-		Francis, Glen	3:56
Durocher, Jean-Yves	3:72	Britannique	3:26	Francis, Jerry	3:56
Durocher, Paul-André	3:56	Albert, Roger		Frankin, Peter	3:30
Duttle, Karl	3:45	Paquette, Roméo		Franklin, J. N.	3:73
		Fédération de la jeunesse		Franklin, John A.	3:46
		ukrainienne du Canada	3:22	Fraser, D. G. L.	3:2
Eager, Evelyn	3:48	Nakoneczny, Richard		Fraser, Eon McKay	3:39
Earl, John	3:22	Fédération des écoles indépen-			& 3:43
Egan, James	3:28	dantes de la Colombie-		Fraser, Simon	3:27
Egan, John	3:84	Britannique	3:27	Fraternité des Indiens des Ter-	
Elder, James S.	3:61	Waller, J. F.		ritoires du Nord-ouest	3:88
English Catholic Education As-		Fédération des Indiens de la		Bird, Ed.	
sociation of Ontario	3:92	Saskatchewan	3:14	Fraternité indienne du Mani-	
Brisbois, Edward J.		Gordon, Walter		toba	2:9
Carty, Michael		Fédération des Métis du		Courchene, David	
Fogarty, P. H.		Manitoba	2:9	Fraternité nationale des Indiens	3:88
Epstein, Linda	3:1	Eagle, Thomas		Marule, Marie	
Equal Rights for Indian Women	3:68	Fédération des Métis, (Section		Manuel, George	
Doré, Cecilia Phillips		Thompson)	2:12	O'Reilly, James	
Erdman, Victor	3:32	Deschambault, Ethel		Frawley, Flo	3:33
Erickson, D. R.	3:14	Head, Edward		Fréchette, Raynald	3:53
Erickson, Hilda	3:47	Fédération mondiale britanni-		Freimuts, Robert	3:19
Erickson, William	2:17	que-israélienne (Canada)		French-Canadian Association	
Étudiants de Sciences sociales,		Incorporée	3:29	of Alberta	3:85
CEGEP de Matane	3:66	Brewer, Dawn		Boucher, Jacques	

Session:Issue		Session:Issue		Session:Issue	
French-Canadian Federation of British Columbia 3:26		Groos, Harold 3:28		Horricks, J. T. 3:31	
Albert, Roger		Groupe canadien-allemand ... 3:73		Horsford, Gregory 3:47	
Paquette, Roméo		Wiss, Jules		Horton, Laura 3:56	
Frolek, E. 3:31		Guerin, Delbert 3:26		Hotson, Alan 3:46	
Frolek, Joseph 3:31			& 3:27	Hougen, Rolf 2:16	
Fulton, E. D. 3:27		Guiho, Joseph 3:55		Houle, Robert 3:65	
	& 3:64	Guilbault, Fernand 3:79		House, Henry Donald 3:21	
Funk, Gilbert 3:84		Gupta, S. N. 3:69		Howard, Lawrence 3:22	
Fyfe, Stewart 3:45		Guy, James 3:3		Howlett, Alphonsine 3:69	
				Howley, Ian 3:27	
Gagné, Bertrand 3:66		Hado, Steve 3:61		Hubbs, David 3:67	
Gagné, Camille 3:67		Haeck, Louis 3:72		Hubka, Brian F. 3:33	
Gagné, Laurent 3:66		Haegert, Joseph 3:28		Huddart, Geoffrey 3:26	
Gagnon, Magloire 3:54		Haenlein, Otto 3:68		Humanist Association of Canada 3:71	
Gagnon, Yvon 3:67		Hager (Mrs./M ^{me}) 3:27		Morgentaler, Henry	
Galgay, Frank 3:77		Hamill, Sally 3:28		Humphries, Don 3:11	
Gallant, E. 2:2		Hamilton, Darcy 3:32		Hunt, A. D. 3:18	
Gamble, G. Alvan 3:20		Hancoy, Eric J. 3:46		Huot, Gilles 3:55	
Garcia, Diego 3:70		Hankia, Garry 3:86		Hurley, Daniel 3:78	
Gareau, Camille 3:66		Hanna, Jessica D. 3:85		Hutton, Edith 3:26	
Garlick, Carolyn 2:9		Hannafor, Ivan 3:48			
Garnes, Rolf 3:40		Hanratty, John 3:3		Indian Brotherhood of the Northwest Territories 3:88	
Gaudet, Jocelyn 3:53		Hansen, Oscar 3:26		Bird, Ed.	
Gaundrone, Margaretta 2:13		Hanson, Samuel B. 3:34		Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada 3:76	
Gauthier, André 3:53		Har, Sabharwal 3:84		Clark, G. A.	
Gauthier, Clovis 3:73		Hargrave, G. G. (Mrs./M ^{me}) .. 3:57		Cumming, Peter	
Gauvin, Denise 3:47		Harper, Allen 3:27		Redditt, J. J. D.	
Gauvin, Gilles 3:66		Harris, Alfred 3:34		Indian Society of Edmonton .. 3:84	
Gedye, Cynthia 3:46		Harris, John 3:30		Gupta, Ram K.	
Gendron, Daniel-Eugène 3:53		Harrison, Arthur 3:22		Institut National Champlain .. 3:65	
Gentles, Ian 3:62		Harrison, John 3:27		Indians of Quebec Association 3:88	
Geoghean, Anthony 2:12		Harrison, Susan 3:23		Hill, George	
Ghandour, Hussein 3:90		Hartnell, Tony 3:30		Plourde, Nora	
Gibbs, Ronald 3:53		Hartney, Michael 3:55		Institut Politique de Trois- Rivières 3:54	
Gibson, Dale 3:7		Haydu, Steve 3:19		Thérien, Marcel	
Giglio, Joseph 3:61		Hayward, John C. 3:29		Institut Voluntas Dei 3:54	
Gilbert, Fernand 3:53		Heald, D. V. 3:12		Avila-Oliver, Phillip B.	
Gilmore, J. W. 3:27		Hearn, Ed 3:1		Instrumentation Society of America 3:29	
Girard, Pierre 3:65		Heaslip, Vernon 3:20		Stirling, P. H.	
Girvin, J. A. 3:30		Heinrich, Jack 3:30		Irwin, F. R. 2:6	
Gobeil, Jean 3:57		Helling, Rudolph 3:23		Irwin, Hugh 3:29	
Gonick, Cy 2:9		Henderson, W. R. S. 3:33		Iser, L. 3:31	
Goodwin, Ross 3:65		Henham, R. 3:29		Italo-Canadian Democratic Association, Toronto 3:62	
Gord, Leslie 3:62		Hennessy, Michael 3:48		Mastrangelo, Rocco	
Gorman, T. W. 3:4		Henneveld, Hank 3:27		Ivany, Otto 3:47	
Gosselin, Narcisse 3:72		Heraldry Society of Canada .. 3:37		Iwanusi, Olaf 3:61	
Goulet, Denis 3:57		Beddoe, Alan B.		Les Jaycees du district de Winnipeg 2:8	
Graauwmans, Casey, H. A. .. 3:84		Beley, George M.		Braid, Arthur 2:8	
Graham, Campbell 3:40		Cartwright, John R.			
Gram, Minerva 3:56		Nunn, Norman A.		Jackson, George 3:21	
Grandbois, Denis 3:47		Herperger, Don 3:11		Jacob, Marcel 3:72	
Grant, Gary 3:2		Hewitt, John 3:22		Jacobsen, Gunnar 3:28	
Grassby, J. N. 3:46		Hill, Cynthia 3:87		Jaffary, Karl D. 3:19	
Gray, Brian J. 3:27		Hill, Richard M. 3:87		Janvier, Aline 3:54	
Grayson, Thomas B. 3:62		Hitschfeld, W. F. 3:90		Jarry, Claude 3:69	
Greater Montreal Anti-Poverty Co-ordinating Committee .. 3:70		Hodgkin, B. D. 3:33		Jarvis, Donald M. 3:39	
Poirier, Peggy		Hodgkinson, R. A. 2:16			
Greenaway, Harold, E. 3:84		Hodgson, W. Thomas 3:57			
Greenshields, Leslie 3:70		Hogan, Lena 3:39			
Grennell, (Mr./M.) 3:30		Hogue, Martial 3:68			
Griffith, N., (Miss) 3:70		Holloway, David 3:26			
Groos, Charles 3:28		Holter, Ian 3:13			
		Hooke, Robert 3:39			

Session: Issue

Session: Issue

Session: Issue

Jaycee Units of Metropolitan Winnipeg	2:8
Braid, Arthur	
Jasmin, Jean-Pierre	3:70
Jasmin, Thérèse	3:65
Jenkins, Henry	3:65
Jenkins, Paul	3:22
Jerusalem, Carol	3:48
Jeunes socialistes	3:84
Poholko, Dave	
Johnson, A. W.	2:4
Johnson, C. D. Paisley	3:31
Johnson, Chris	3:46
Johnson, Jack	3:33
Johnson, J. M.	3:34
Johnson, Ron	3:26
Johnston, Ron	2:12
Joint Municipal Committee on Intergovernmental Relations	3:50
Burns, R. M.	
D'Amour, M.	
Dent, I. G.	
Newman, D. G.	
O'Brien, A.	
Jones, I. C. (Mrs./Mme)	3:28
Jones, Léonard C.	3:80
Joy, S. J. (Mrs./Mme)	3:30
Joyal, Marcel	3:39
Julien, Pierre-André	3:54

Kacaba, Michael	3:19
Kalevar, Chaitanya	3:20
Kalevar, C. K.	3:19
Kamloops Diocesan Catholic Public School Trustees Association	3:31
Beesley, J. F. B.	
Kamloops District Teachers' Association	3:31
Phillips, A. M.	
Kan, Fred C.	3:20
Kanee, D.	3:29
Katz, Leon	3:58
Kear, A. R.	2:11
Kearney, G. A.	3:48
Kearns, Brian	2:15
Keast, J.	3:47
Keehr, O. J.	3:11
Keffer, T. C.	3:34
Keefer, Thomas	3:62
Kehoe, Gerard	3:31
Keliher, T. L.	3:39
Kemp, Gavin Neil	3:32
Kennedy, James	3:22
Kénogami Chamber of Commerce	3:67
Turcotte, Jean-Jacques	
Kerbel, Joel Anthony	3:29
Kerner, Ilona	3:70
Kernighan, Murray S.	3:19
Keyes, Kenneth	3:45
Keyes, Tom E.	3:12
Keytop, William A.	3:32
Kilbourn, William	3:19

Kilfoil, Cecil J.	3:79
Kilgore, Harry W.	3:19
& 3:21	
Killen, Stewart	3:3
King, Teresa	3:32
Kingwell, P. J.	3:70
Kitts, James	3:80
Kizerskis, Al	3:71
Knechtel, Keith	3:28
Knoll, John A.	3:13
Knott, Ernie	3:27
Kobluk, W. D.	3:84
& 3:85	
Koern, Heinz	3:19
Kohut, Myroslaw	3:48
Konash, Michael	3:85
Kordyban, William	3:30
Kowasl, Michael	3:85
Krepakevich, Duane	3:13
Kripps, Agnes	3:26
Kristiansen, John	2:17
Kroeker, John	3:43
Krueger, Leonard	2:11
Kucharyshyn, Marusia	3:20
& 3:61	
Kuyek, Joan	3:46
Kuziak, A. G.	3:13
Kwavnick, David	3:40

Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto	3:61
Montgomery, D. K.	
Labuda, Joe	3:28
LaChance, Claire	3:72
Lacourcière, Gérald	3:56
Lacroix, Joseph	3:65
Ladyman, J. T.	3:63
Lafond, France	3:72
Lafontaine, Christopher	3:12
Lahey, William	3:77
Laing, Gordon	3:2
Lajeunesse, Claude	3:54
Lalonde, E.	3:46
Lalonde, Jacques	3:55
Lalonde, Judy	3:56
Lambie, James T.	3:28
Lamothe, Charles	3:72
Lanari, Robert	3:80
Landry, Robert	3:67
Landry, Simone	3:71
Lang, Léopold	3:79
Langley, Ken	3:3
Langlois, Alain	3:66
Langlois, Jacques	3:57
Langlois, Paul	3:54
Langlois, P.	3:67
Langmark, Otto C.	3:21
& 3:61	
Lanthier, Aldema	3:46
LaPierre, Laurier	3:41
Lapierre, Paul-Eugène	3:53
Laplanche, H.	3:70
Lapointe, Bernard	3:67
Lapointe, Roland	3:55

Lapointe, Roméo	3:67
Laskin, Saul	3:48
Latham, Johnston	3:30
Lauder, Jim	3:39
Lauzon, Patrick	3:47
Lavoie, Eudore	3:79
Lavoie, Raymond	3:65
Lawton, Ernest	2:17
Laycock, Francis E.	3:13
Lazarus, Felix	3:68
Leblanc, Charles N.	3:80
LeBlanc, Guy	3:66
Leblanc, Jean-André	3:57
Leblond, C. P.	3:70
Leclerc, Antoine	3:65
Leclerc, Louis	3:65
Leddy, J. F.	3:23
Lederman, William	3:6
Leduc, François	3:66
Lees, W. S.	3:21
Legendre, Guy	3:57
Léger, Jules	2:3
Lemieux, B. J.	3:27
Lepage, Alma	3:70
Leslie, Peter	3:45
Lesser, David A.	3:29
Lethbridge Chamber of Commerce	3:32
Bond, W.	
Tanner, Morley	
Lauszler, Winnie	3:26
Lévesque, Rodrigue	3:43
Lewis, Don	3:28
Liberal Party of Alberta	3:85
Russell, Robert	
Liberal Party of Canada (Quebec)	3:82
Blouin, Denise	
Côté, Micheline	
Fortier, Jean	
Guilbault, Jacques	
Labelle, Maurice	
Lefebvre, Jean-Paul	
Rodger, Ginette	
Tardif, Réal	
Lidster, Echo L. R.	3:86
Ligue canadienne des droits de l'homme au Manitoba	2:10
Ligue monarchiste du Canada (la section Vancouver)	3:29
Young, J. C.	
Ligue des Monarchistes du Canada	3:39
Galloway, Strome	
Williamson, E. L. R.	
Likely, Frank	3:2
Lim, William A.	3:29
Limbrick, D. H.	3:48
Lindsay, William Jack	3:28
Linton, W. Ivan	2:6
Lipton, Charles	3:68
Lithwick, Harvey	3:91
Llanos, Marc	3:61
Long, Edward	3:19

Session: Issue		Session: Issue		Session: Issue	
Long, Harold	2:11	Manning, Donald M.	3:29	McTaggart, Lloyd	3:46
Lord, Maxime	3:55	Manning, E. Preston	3:85	McWhinney, Edward	3:10
Lort, Tony	3:27	March, Roman	3:21	Medcalf, Jack C.	3:27
Lotchell, J. L.	3:19	Marcoux, Alain	3:66	Mélançon, Claude	3:55
Lott, Shirley	2:15	Marshall, Hilda A. J.	3:28	Melkvi, Zoltan	3:84
Love, J. D.	3:28	Marshall, Joe	3:3	Ménard, Michel A.	3:53
Lower, A. R. M.	3:75	Martin, C.	3:39	Ménard, Pam	3:23
Ludwig, John	3:85	Martin, C. D.	3:47	Menear, David W.	3:22
Lutczyk, M.	3:19	Martin, Chris	3:40	Merits, Roxanne	3:48
Lyon, Noel	3:16		& 3:43	Metcalfe, Thomas	3:68
Lysyk, K.	2:4	Martin, Dennis H.	3:62	Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg	2:8 & 2:11
	& 3:59	Martin, Murdo	3:56		
		Martini, I. C.	3:34		
		Martyn, R. E.	3:34	Rebchuck, S.	
Maberly, Collier	3:29	Mass, Phyllis	3:70	Willis, Jack	
MacAdams, Douglas	3:26	Massicotte, Gérald	3:55	Wolfe, B. R.	
MacCormack, J. R.	3:1	Maten, Steve	3:68	Zuken, J.	
MacDonald, Alex	3:29	Matheson, Don	3:13	Metropolitan Toronto Separate School Board	3:92
Macdonald, Angus	3:26	Matkin, James	3:52	Fullerton, J. A.	
MacDonald, Bill	3:2		& 3:29	Heenan, G. B.	
MacDonald, Calvin	3:70	Matte, Louis-Joseph	3:30	McDonald, D. F.	
Macdonald, David	3:26	Maxim, James M.	3:33	Middleton, H. A. (Mrs./M ^{me})	3:62
MacDonald, David	3:29	Maxim, (de Bané), Paul	3:90	Miljours, Henri	3:55
MacDonald, Vincent	3:3	Maxwell, D. S.	2:5	Millar, Dean	3:29
MacDougall, G. A. (Mrs./M ^{me})	3:67	Maxwell, Hubert, V.	3:56	Miller, Bertha	3:78
Macdougall, John, H.	3:4	Maxwell, Wendell J.	3:80	Miller, Jim	2:13
MacKasey, S.	3:1	McAllister, Kenneth	3:26	Milne, David	3:5
MacKenzie, Angus G.	3:34		& 3:29	Minard, Marilyn M.	3:68
MacKenzie, Brenda	3:43	McCabe, Earle	3:48	Miners, Joan	3:67
MacKenzie, Douglas	3:22	McCallion, Frank	2:17	Minov, Nick	3:22
MacKenzie, James	3:26	McCallum, Jean	3:85	Moeller, Paul	3:23
MacKinnon, Frank	3:33	McCann, Marie	3:45	Moffat, H. A.	3:30
MacLean, David G.	3:4	McCarthy, J. V.	3:77	Monarchist League of Canada	3:39
MacLelland, Kathleen	3:5	McClennan, Scott	3:22	Galloway, Strome	
MacLeod, Gregory J.	3:3	McCloskey, T. J.	3:30	Williamson, E. L. R.	
MacLeod, W. D.	3:28	McCormick, Earle	3:46	Monarchist League of Canada (Vancouver Branch)	3:29
MacNeil, Kenzie	3:3	McCormick, J. L.	3:19	Young, A. C.	
MacPherson, Jim	3:2	McCorry, Sue	3:46	Monbourquette, Joanne	3:47
MacQuarrie, Bob	3:86	McCurry, Brian	3:47	Morassut, Carla	3:47
Magmuson, Bruce	3:19	McCutcheon, Gordon	3:48	Moreau, Charles A.	3:65
Magrath Chamber of Commerce, Magrath, Alberta	3:32	McDonald, Patrick	3:85	Morgan, David	3:48
Spencer, J. A.		McEwen, John	3:46	Morgan, Fay	3:68
Maguire, Derek P.	3:33	McGarvie, David	3:27	Morin, Jacques-Yvan	3:75
Maguire, Stephen	3:45	McGeer, Patrick L.	3:27	Morin, Roger	3:78
Mailhot, Claude (M ^{me} /Mrs.)	3:73	McGill University, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, Montreal, (Que.)	3:90	Morris, Fred	3:40
Mailhot, Magdeleine	3:70	Bates, David		Morrison, Ann	3:46
Mainville, Claude	3:68	Douglas, Virginia		Morton, Murray D.	3:22
Major, Claude	3:57	Hitschfeld, W. F.		Morton, W. L.	3:38
Maki, Marilyn	3:46	Mallory, J. K.		Mosdell, B.	3:26
Makoski, H. E. F.	3:28	Maxwell, M.		Mosdell, William	3:27
Maley, Jack	3:27	Pavlasek, T. J.		Mouton, Joseph	3:73
Mallalieu, Norman	3:34	Yaffe, L.		Mowers, Cleo	3:32
Mallory, D. R. G.	3:31	McGregor, David J.	3:28	Mozol, Stan	3:28
Mallory, J. R.	3:24	McIver, Bernice	2:17	Mundy, John	3:45
	& 3:90	McKamey, Ray	2:14	Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto—Municipalité de To- ronto	3:63
Maloney, John, H.	3:5	McLaughlin, Brian	3:26	Campbell, A. M.	
Manitoba Indian Federation	2:9	McLaughlin, Claire	3:63	Munroe, Lillian	2:13
Courchene, David		McLaughlin, W.	3:29	Murry, P. J.	3:77
Manitoba Metis Federation	2:9	McLean, Dave	3:30	Myers, Marie	3:56
Eagle, Thomas		McLeod, D. A.	3:12		
Manitoba Metis Federation (Thompson Section)	2:12	McMahon, Peter	3:34		
Deschambault, Ethel		McMath, R. A.	3:27		
Head, Edward		McNeill, Mary	3:61		

Session:Issue		Session:Issue		Session:Issue	
Nabess, Andrew	2:12	Nouveau Parti Démocratique		Parti progressiste conservateur	
Nadeau, Robert	3:40	de l'Ontario	3:19	de la Colombie-Britannique .	3:29
Naduriak, Robert	3:11	Lewis, Stephen		de Wolf, John	
Naidu, M. V.	2:10	Renwick, James		Parti Québécois du Comté de	
Nash, Mark	3:27	Nova Scotians United for Life	3:80	Portneuf	3:65
National Chapter of Canada of		Moir, Mildred		Gagnon, Guy	
the I.O.D.E.	3:62	Novini, Andrew	3:23	Parti Québécois, exécutif ré-	
Morrison, W. R. (Mrs./		Nutik, Allen E.	3:69	gional, Saguenay-Lac-St-	
M ^{me})				Jean	3:67
Tait, George E. (Mrs./				Bédard, Marc-André	
M ^{me})		O'Brien, Allan	3:1	Patenaude, Pierre	3:53
National Council of Women of		O'Brien, B.	3:48	Paterson, A. Ben	3:54
Canada	3:74	Oddson, Lief	3:84	Patterson, Charles A. M.	3:26
Booth, Ann		Odellel, Albert	3:46	Patterson, Dennis	3:1
Steadman, S. F.		O'Donahue, Anthony	3:19	Pattie, Brian	3:31
(The) National Farmers Union		O'Hearn, Peter, J. T.	3:1	Pattison, Stephen	3:28
(New Brunswick District) ..	3:79	Ohs, Don	3:31	Patton, Jamie	3:2
Dionne, James		Ontario New Democratic Party	3:19	Paulik, Ozy	3:68
National Indian Brotherhood	3:88	Lewis, Stephen		Payne, John L.	3:33
Manuel, George		Renwick, James		Peacock, Anne	3:69
Marule, Marie		Opération Dignité	3:66	Pearson, William	2:10
O'Reilly, James		Banville, Charles		Peckford, Ewart	3:77
National Institute of Cham-		Oppel, Magnus	3:28	Peel, Kenneth	3:71
plain	3:65	Orange, Robert J.	3:86	Pelletier, Pierre	3:69
Boulanger, Georges		O'Reilly, Edward A.	3:47	Pelletier, René	3:53
National Society of the Aca-		Osland, Les	2:17	Penna, James	3:14
dians	3:80	Osler, Cam F.	2:11	Penner, Benny	3:86
Cormier, Hector J.		O'Toole, Ronald	3:68	Penton, M. J.	3:32
Godbout, Victor		Oucharek, Bob	3:11	People Helping People Society	3:85
Neely, Barbara	3:23			Loring, Marion	
Neish, Elgin	3:28	Palanthara, Vincent	3:68	Perreault, Michel	3:85
Nelligan, John	3:40	Palazzio, F. Mrs.	3:68	Pettenuzzo, Donna	3:47
Newbound, Lyndell	3:85	Palmer, A. E.	3:32	Philibert, Olivier	3:66
New Brunswick Francophone		Palmer, John R. N.	3:61	Philibert, Robert	3:57
Teachers' Association	3:80	Papineau, Alfred	3:39	Phillips, Arthur	3:26
Desjardins, Gérard		Paquette, Omer	3:31	Phillips, D.	3:13
Richard, Jean		Paradis, Claude	3:65	Phillips, Margaret	3:48
New Brunswick Human Rights		Parent, Marcel	3:66	Phipps, Peter	3:2
Commission	3:78	Parizeau, Jacques	3:44	Pilon, Aurèle	3:57
Kinsella, Noël A.		Parris, Bob	3:30	Pilon, Gregory A.	3:39
New Canada and North Amer-		Parti communiste canadien,		Pilon, Henriette	3:28
ica Union Party	3:63	Comité central de direction .	3:81	Pittman, George	3:63
Reiner, Fred		Demers, Claire		Plamondon, Jean	3:71
New Democratic Members of		Kashtan, William		Polish Canadian Congress	3:72
the Saskatchewan Legisla-		Parti communiste du Canada,		Kawaczak, Andrew	
ture	3:11	Comité provincial du Mani-		Romer, Tadeusz	
Blakeney, Allan		toba	2:11	Pontbriand, Denis	3:53
Nielsen, Erik	2:13	Ross, William		Portnuff, H. (Mrs./M ^{me})	3:13
Noble, Madeline	3:29	Parti communiste du Québec ..	3:81	Porter, Gary	3:29
Nolan, Peter John	3:40	Walsh, Samuel J.		Potter, Calvin C.	3:81
Nordling, Axel	2:13	Parti libéral de l'Alberta	3:85	Potter, J. Lee	3:80
Normand, Antoine	3:65	Russell, Robert		Potter, Winifred	3:71
Norris-Elye, Michael	3:40	Parti libéral du Canada (Qué-		Potvin, André	3:73
Northerners United for		béc)	3:82	Pouget, Gerald A.	3:23
Equality	3:86	Blouin, Denise		Powell, John C.	3:43
Demelt, Stuart		Côté, Micheline		Powell, Peter	3:27
Northwest Territories Teach-		Fortier, Jean		Powell, S. A.	3:71
ers' Association		Guilbault, Jacques		Powers, Robert E.	3:32
Jenkins, Robert		Labelle, Maurice		Pozer, Phylis	3:79
Nouveau Parti Démocratique de		Lefebvre, Jean-Paul		Prasow, David E.	3:33
l'Assemblée Législative de la		Rodger, Ginette		Predeman, Jane	3:27
Saskatchewan	3:11	Tardif, Réal		Presunka, Peter	3:57
Blakeney, Allan				Pretulac, Nick	3:56
				Previsch, Nick	3:32
				Price, Trevor	3:23

Session: Issue	Session: Issue	Session: Issue
Prince George-Peace River Progressive Conservative Association 3:30	Renaud, Jean-Charles 3:68	Satchell, Charlie 3:19
Rankle, Peter	Reuter, Joe 3:31	Saulnier, Al 3:46
Prociuk, Alex Wm. 3:14	Reynolds, Gregory 3:56	Savage, Helen (Mrs./M ^{me}) ... 3:79
Progressive Conservative Party of British Columbia 3:29	Reynolds, Keith A. 3:11	Savaria, Jeannine 3:70
de Wolf, John	Richard, Norman E. 3:48	Savaria, Georges 3:70
Promethean Society, Montreal 3:91	Richard, Guy W. 3:69	Savoie, Anne-Marie 3:79
de Ruijter, Frans	Richards, David G. 3:27	Savoie, Roger 3:80
Rybikowski, M.	Rickard, Bruce 3:26	Say, Vivian 3:27
Tchipeff, A. N.	Rickwood, Roger 3:19	Sayer, Bernadette 3:57
Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal 3:69	Rimer, Jim 2:15	Scalzo, Rudolph 3:68
Tilley, A. Reid	Rioux, Conrad 3:73	& 3:71
Proulx, Mario 3:53	Rivard, Téléphore 3:73	Schelew, Bernie 3:80
Provincial Organization of Bu- siness and Professional Wo- men's Clubs of Alberta 3:84	Robb, D. W. 3:28	Schelew, Michael 3:80
Armstrong, Ellen	Roberts, Helen 3:67	Schmeiser, Douglas A. 3:49
Puziak, Dan 3:86	Roberts, J. A. 3:28	Schmidt, Camille 3:68
Pye, Bill 3:39	Robertson, Alastair Howard .. 3:78	Schmidt, Carl C. 3:72
	Robertson, R. G. 2:2	Schwab, Robert 3:4
Quebec Association of School Administrators (South Shore Local) 3:73	Robichaud, Raoul 3:73	Schwarz, A. D. 3:72
Fransham, J. H.	Robidas, Jacques 3:53	Scott, F. R. 3:6
Quebec Provincial Command of Army, Navy and Airforce Veterans of Canada 3:70	Robinson, B. 3:18	Scott, Frank 3:17
Fedosen, Phil	Robinson, George W. 3:78	Scott, J. Russell 3:61
Quebec Union of Ukrainian Students 3:91	Rooney, John 3:61	Scott, W. A. 3:28
Pryszlak, Thor	Rosamilia, Raphaël 3:53	Scratch, H. H. M. 3:22
Yakimiw, Evhen	Ross, Darryl 3:2	Searle, David H. 3:86
Yakimiw, Françoise	Rotenburg, Ted 3:19	Segsworth, Heather 3:46
	Rothney, G. O. 2:11	Segsworth, R. V. 3:46
Radicals for Capitalism of Toronto 3:21	Rouzier, Gilbert 3:66	Self, G. M. 3:34
Wilson, Raymond Todd	Roy, Alfred 3:65	Sewell, John 3:61
Rainbow, Gordon 3:62	Royer, Maurice H. 3:39	Shaw, E. C. 2:9
Rainville, B. 3:71	Royer, Roland 3:65	Shaw, Ethel 3:28
Rakobowchuk, Gerald 3:39	Ruben, Max 3:62	Shaw, R. L. 3:31
Rapoch, Andrew J. 3:39	Rubin, Stephen 3:68	Shortt, Ken 2:16
& 3:40	Rudnyckyj, J. B. 3:89	Sick, Nigel S. 3:23
Rasmussen, George 3:27	Ruest, Jean-Louis 3:66	Silbert, Morris 3:21
Ratushny, E. 3:23	Rumack, Martin 3:62	Simard, Louis 3:79
Ray, Pat 2:13	Russelle, Lorenzo 3:31	Simard, Louis-Michel 3:67
Rayburn, Judith 3:61	Ryan, Chuck 3:3	Simoneau, Jean 3:53
Rayner, F. J. 3:30	Ryan, Edward 3:19	Simpson, Michael 3:86
Raz, Victor M. 3:27	Ryan, John Wayne 3:26	Sims, David 3:63
Redmond, Gerald 3:28	& 3:27	Sinclair, Seeta G. 3:22
Regina Chamber of Commerce 3:11	Ryan, William F. 3:35	Singer, Allan 3:70
McLeod, R. A.		Singh, H. 3:46
Regina Civil Liberties	Sagle, Fred M. 3:46	Silverman, S. 3:20
Association 3:11	Saini, G. R. 3:78	Snedker, J. E. 3:34
Beke, John	Saint-Aubin, Cléophas 3:70	Snyder, Ken 2:13
Regina Single Parents Im- provement Association 3:12	Saint John Diocesan Council of the Catholic Women's League of Canada 3:78	Société anti-pollution et de contrôle du milieu (Vancou- ver C.-B.) 3:26
Tutt, Sherrie	McLean, Muriel	Mallard, Derrick
Reimanin, Richard John 3:33	Sakowski, Henry 3:27	Société d'instrumentation d'Amérique 3:29
Reiner, Fred 3:61	Salem, Phil 3:48	Stirling, P. H.
Rempel, Patricia A. M. 3:33	Salois, Fabien 2:13	Société Franco-Manitobaine .. 2:11
	Sametz, Z. W. 3:77	Mannin, Michel
	Sanders, Douglas 3:23	Société héraldique du Canada . 3:37
	Sansom, Lucy 3:78	Beddoe, Alan B.
	Saskatchewan Association of Students 3:14	Beley, George M.
	Brown, Larry	Cartwright, John R.
	Saskatchewan School Trustees Association 3:12	Nunn, Norman A.
	Dunbar, Frederick L.	Société des Hindous d'Edmon- ton 3:84
	Saskatchewan Urban Munici- palities Association 3:11	Gupta, Ram K.
	Murphy, J.	

Session: Issue

Société historique régionale de Trois-Rivières	3:54
Godin, Conrad	
Société Nationale des Acadiens	3:80
Cormier, Hector J.	
Godbout, Victor	
Société nationale des Québécois du Saguenay-Lac-St-Jean ..	3:67
Bouchard, Philippe- Auguste	
Société Prométhéenne, Mont- réal	3:91
de Ruijter, Frans	
Rybikowski, M.	
Tchipeff, A. N.	
Sirant, Bahlán	3:84
Sirois, Langis	3:80
Sirois, Vincent	3:67
Sloan, Christopher	3:86
Small, Ella	3:28
Smedley, Audrey	3:30
Smeenk, Theodore	3:22
Smiley, Donald V.	3:25
Smith, Brian	3:28
Smith, Denis	3:75
Smith, Howard	3:26
Smith, Jean	3:62
Smith, Peter	3:45
Smith, Rick	3:46
Smith, Robert	3:28
Smith, Sandra	3:2
Smith, T. B.	2:5
Smyth, Ross	3:68
Sociétés Saint-Jean-Baptiste de Sherbrooke, Amos, Québec, Ste-Anne-de-la-Pocatière et Valleyfield	3:53
Deserres, Louis	
Hubert, Jean	
Roberge, Yvon	
White, Peter G.	
Sociétés Saint-Jean Baptiste ..	3:65
Hubert, Jean	
Société technique des Ukrainiens du Canada	3:61
Spolsky, Yuri	
Society for Pollution and Envi- ronmental Control (Vancou- ver, B.C.)	3:26
Mallard, Derrick	
Society to Overcome Pollution	3:71
Retallack, Evelyn	
Sommerville, William	3:1
Sopha, Elmer	3:46
Sopha, Wendy	3:46
Spalton, Edward	2:11
Spark, R. (Mrs./M ^{me})	3:45
Speckeen, F. J.	3:30
Spencer, André	3:28
Spiegel, Mel	3:68
Squamish Indian Band Council	3:27
Mathias, Joe	
St-Arnaud, Yolande	3:70
St-Cyr, Mark	3:73
St-Laurent, Benoît	3:55

Session: Issue

St. Laurent, Ray	3:85
Stathatos Jean	3:70
Steen, John	3:22
Stein, Michael	3:71
Steinhart, James R.	3:40
Steinle, Dennis	3:28
Stevens, David	3:86
Stewardson, Dave	3:11
Stewart, Gordon	3:33
Stewart, John	3:4
Stewart, P.	3:34
Stirling, Leonard	3:77
Stirling, Mark	3:26
&	3:27
Stony, Jamie	3:80
Stortini, Helen	3:47
Strauss, William	2:17
Strayer, B. L.	2:3
Strong, Heather	3:80
Submarwal, Paul	3:84
Sullivan, Patrick W.	3:4
Sundstrum, James	3:19
Sutherland, Ray	3:68
Sutter, D. B.	2:10
Swan, Doreen L.	3:32
Sykes, P. S.	3:30
Sykes, Rod	3:33
Symons, J. W. D.	3:28
Syndicat national des fermiers (district du Nouveau- Brunswick)	3:79
Dionne, James	
Szentandrási, Michael	3:27
Szoboszloi, Zoltan	3:19
Tanguay, André	3:72
Taraboulsi, Nicolas	3:70
Tarasoff, Ann	3:28
Tardif, Yves	3:72
Tarnopolsky, Walter	3:8
Taylor, Arthur	3:23
Taylor, Don	2:15
Taylor, Erwin	3:53
Taylor, T.	3:40
Tellier, J. H.	3:70
Tenholder, William	3:57
Tennant, Elizabeth	3:34
Tennant, Walton	3:31
ter Heide, Jill	3:30
Tésu, Lorenzo	3:90
Thériault, Aimé	3:53
Thériault, Jacques	3:72
Thiffault, Wilbray	3:54
Thomlinson, S. A.	3:34
Thompson Basin Pollution Probe	3:31
Balf, Mary	
Thompson Chamber of Commerce	2:12
Johnston, B.	
Thompson, David	3:27
Thompson, Donald	3:28
Thompson, P. W. (Mrs./M ^{me}) .	3:27
Thomson, Brian	3:19

Session: Issue

Thomson, Greg	3:11
Thorburn, Hugh C.	3:45
Tickner, Larry	3:28
Tieman, Janet	3:47
Tillema, Ken	3:84
Timmons, Mike	3:67
Timmons, Pat	3:66
Tingley, C.	3:30
Tobac, Addy	3:87
Todd, John	3:70
Toming, Voldemar	3:63
Tool, Robert	2:15
Torok, S.	3:56
Toronto and District Liberal Association	3:19
McLaughlin, Claire	
Toronto and District Liberal Association (Ethnic Com- mittee)	3:61
Gilbart, John	
Toronto Right to Life Com- mittee	3:62
Fish, Belvia	
Hezewyk, B. Van	
Landolt, Gwendolyn	
Morris, Heather	
Vennir, W. G.	
Toth, Tom	3:23
Tremblay, André	3:88
Tremblay, Jean	3:26
Trimbee, James W.	3:19
Troestler, Paul-Pierre	3:67
Trois-Rivières Chamber of Commerce, Trois-Rivières, (Qué.)	3:54
Tuchel, Albert	3:19
Tucker, Marion	3:33
Tupper, D.	3:29
Tupper, David	3:80
Turcotte, Georges-Jacques	3:65
Turner, Edward	2:11
Turner, Hon. John N., Minister of Justice and Attorney Gen- eral of Canada	2:1
Turner, l'hon. John N. ministre de la Justice et procureur général du Canada	
Turner, Paul	3:28
Tyner, Colleen	2:13
Uberall, Eugene	3:26
Ubriaco, Rita	3:48
Ukrainian Alumni Association, Toronto, Ontario	3:61
Darewych, J. W.	
Petryshyn, W. R.	
Ukrainian Association of Northwestern Quebec and Northwestern Ontario	3:55
Chayka, Léo	
Ukrainian Canada Committee (Montreal Section)	3:73
Hykawy, J.	
Karpishka, Roman B.	

Session:Issue	Session:Issue	Session:Issue
Ukrainian Canadian Committee (Toronto Section) 3:19	Union of New Brunswick Indians 3:88	Villemaire, Roland 3:53
Zarowsky, Bohdan	Francis, Anthony	Vinslov, Nina A. 3:85
Ukrainian Canadian Students Union 3:19	Union of Nova Scotia Indians 3:3 & 3:88	Viola, Charles 3:21
Bandera, Andrew	Doucette, Noël	Viola, Rose 3:47
Fedchun, Gerry	Union of Ontario Indians 3:88	Voynaud, Pierrette 3:55
Kudurisysdyn, Marusia	Peters, Omer	
Ukrainian Club of the Univer- sity of Western Ontario, London, Ontario 3:22	United Nations Association .. 3:14	Waddington, M. 3:31
Dubas, O.	Williams, Colwyn D.	Wagenberg, R. H. 3:23
Ukrainiens du Nord-Ouest du Québec et du Nord-Ouest de l'Ontario 3:55	United Nations Association in Canada 3:72	Wagner, Kathleen 3:46
Chayka, Léo	Bazar, Bernard (Mrs./M ^{me}) .. 3:72	Walkem, Forrest 3:31
Ukrainian Heritage Association of Canada 3:62	University of Lethbridge, Department of Political Science Students, Lethbridge, Alberta 3:32	Walker, Elizabeth 3:26
Melnyk, Roman	Runge, Ken	Walker, Norman 3:61
Ukrainian National Youth Federation of Canada 3:22	Slemko, Brian	Walker, Micheline 3:26
Nakoneczny, Richard	University of Lethbridge, Faculty Members of the Department of Political Science, Lethbridge, Alberta 3:32	Walkley (Mr./M.) 3:62
Ukrainian Professional and Business Men's Club of Edmonton 3:84	Université de Lethbridge, Dé- partement de sciences politi- ques (Membres de la faculté)	Wallot, Hubert 3:53
Barabash, Harry	Doerr, Audrey	Ward, Michael 3:26
Decore, Laurence G.	Elton, David	Ward, Norman 3:14
Dzenick, Russell	Hoyt, Martin	Ward, William 3:20
Faryna, Les H.	Université McGill, faculté des études graduées et de la recherche 3:90	Wark, Brian 3:26
Hyrak, Wasyl	Bates, David	Wasteneys, Geoffrey 3:43
Kostash, William	Douglas, Virginia	Watson, Steve 3:28
Savaryn, Peter	Hitschfeld, W. F.	Waywood, W. 3:27
Ukrainian Technical Society of Canada 3:61	Mallory, J. R.	Wearn, Arnold 3:22
Spolsky, Yuri	Maxwell, M.	Webb, Howard 3:30
Ukrainian Youth Association of Canada 3:61	Pavlasek, T. J.	Wedderburn, H. A. J. 3:1
Bardyn, I. N.	Yaffe, L.	Weiland, Angelika 3:2
Luczkin, Maria	Universities of British Colum- bia; Notre Dame University of Nelson; Simon Fraser Uni- versity; University of British Columbia; University of Victoria 3:27	Westell, Anthony 3:40
Zazula, Roman	Universités de la Colombie-Bri- tannique; l'Université Notre- Dame de Nelson; l'Université Simon Fraser; l'Université de la Colombie-Britannique; l'Université de Victoria	Western Canada Party 3:85
Union des chefs de la Colombie- Britannique 3:88	Clark, Robert M.	Beck, G. K. J.
Wilson, Bill	Unka, Bernadette 2:15	Westmount Action Committee . 3:71
Union des chefs indiens de la Colombie-Britannique 3:27	Unterberg, Paul 3:72	Carrothers, David
Tyndall, Donna T.		Whalen, Hugh 3:77
Union des étudiants ukrainiens du Québec 3:91		Wheaton, Robert 3:27
Pryszlak, Ihor		Whent, J. A. 3:48
Yakimiw, Evhen		White, Archie 2:16
Yakimiw, Françoise		White, Howard 3:78
Union des Indiens de la Nouvelle-Écosse 3:88		White, Walter 3:23
Doucette, Noël		White, W. E. 3:70
Union des Indiens de l'Ontario 3:88		Whitehorse Chamber of Com- merce, Whitehorse, Yukon Territory 2:16
Peters, Omer		Hudson, R. E.
Union des Indiens du Nouveau-Brunswick 3:88		Wilkins, Robert 3:39
Francis, Anthony		Williams, Dennis 3:87
Union of British Columbia Chiefs 3:88		Williams, Tom 3:40
Wilson, Bill		Wilson, Doris 3:11
Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs 3:27		Wills, Harold A. 3:46
Tyndall, Donna T.		Wilton, Pam 2:16
		Wilton, W. H. 2:10
		Windsor and District Labour Council (Legislative Com- mittee) 3:23
		Batterson, Les
		Wing, George 2:16
		Wing, Peter 3:31
		Wishlaw, Jack 3:61
		Wodiuk, William 3:61
		Wong, Peter 3:26
		Wood, Gary 3:46
		Woods, John 3:34
		World Federalists of Canada .. 3:83
		Smyth, Ross

Session: Issue		Session: Issue		Session: Issue	
World Federalists of Canada		Yaffe, L.	3:90	Yukon Chamber of Mines	2:14
(Calgary Branch)	3:34	Yalden, M. F.	2:3	Hilker, R. G.	
Macqueen, R. W.		Yate, Tom	3:87	Robertson, H. David	
World Federalists of Canada		Yip, Michael	3:87		
(Montreal Branch)	3:71	Young, Aurèle	3:80		
Arnopoulos, P. J.		Young Socialists	3:84	Zacks, Ted	3:27
Wright, Diana	3:14	Poholko, Dave		Zalm, William N. Vander	3:26
Wright, L. H.	3:66	Youth on Canada Committee		Zaseybida, N. (Mrs./M ^{me})	3:85
Wright, W. N.	3:62	(Burnaby, British Columbia) 3:27		Zip, Martin	3:14
Wrynn, Edward	3:80	Bishop, Robert		Zitouni, Sid A.	3:69
		Hughes, Robert		Zivku, John	3:56

APPENDIX E

List of other Submissions

The following are individuals and groups whose submissions were not printed since they did not testify before the Committee.

- Académie ukrainienne libre des sciences, Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Adams, D., Toronto, Ontario
 Adams, D. R., Vancouver, British Columbia
 Adie, Alan, Yorkton, Saskatchewan
 Alberta Catholic School Trustees Association, Edmonton, Alberta
 Alberta Teachers' Association, Edmonton, Alberta
 Alexander, John, Willowdale, Ontario
 Anciens combattants de l'Armée, de la Marine et de l'Aviation du Canada, Unité 367 de Chambly, Québec
 Andrews, Paul, Glovertown, Newfoundland
 Ashby, Irene M., Toronto, Ontario
 Ashworth, G. W., West Vancouver, British Columbia
 Association Canadienne d'Hygiène Publique, Toronto, Ontario
 Association canadienne pour l'hygiène publique, section de la Colombie-Britannique, Burnaby, Colombie-Britannique
 Association contre l'avortement, Vancouver, Colombie-Britannique
 Association Dentaire Canadienne, Toronto, Ontario
 Association des Commissions des Écoles Bilingues d'Ontario, Ottawa, Ontario
 Association des commissaires des écoles catholiques de l'Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta
 Association des commissaires des écoles catholiques du Canada
 Association des enseignants de l'Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta
 Association des loyalistes de l'Empire uni du Canada, Toronto, Ontario
 Association du barreau canadien, sous-section de la régionale de l'Ontario, droit constitutionnel et international, Toronto, Ontario
 Association pour nos drapeaux du siècle, Victoria, Colombie-Britannique
 Austin, R. W., Downsview, Ontario
 Bailey, A. L., Burlington, Ontario
 Baldwin, R. M. (Mr. and Mrs.) Ottawa, Ontario
 Bande indienne de Cooks-Ferry, Colombie-Britannique
 Barnabe, Claire M., Port Burwell, Northwest Territories
 Baxter, Larry, Halifax, Nova Scotia
 Bazinet, André
 Beange, W., Wasaga Beach, Ontario
 Bedi, A. D., Vancouver, British Columbia
 Béland, J. N. Roland, Ottawa, Ontario
 Bennett, Charles, St-Norbert, Manitoba
 Bensh, S. A., Nanaimo, British Columbia
 Bernard, Claude, Québec, Québec
 Bond, Margaret, Toronto, Ontario
 Bonhomme, R. L., Hull, Québec
 Bonner, Grace, Toronto, Ontario
 Bourgeois, Pierre, New Westminster, British Columbia
 Bournival, Simon, Trois-Rivières, Québec
 Bowden, David, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Bowen, J. A. C., Toronto, Ontario
 Bowring, David, Oshawa, Ontario
 British Columbia Parent-Teacher Federation, Burnaby, British Columbia
 Brown, A. (Mr. & Mrs.) Scarborough, Ontario
 Brown, Brian, Victoria, British Columbia
 Brown, Richard A. C., Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Buerting, James, Kipling, Saskatchewan
 Burion, Yvonne, Dawson City, Yukon Territory
 Campbell, Burt, Castlegar, British Columbia
 Canadian Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans, Unit no. 367, Chambly, Quebec
 Canadian Bar Association (Ontario Branch) Constitutional and International Sub-section, Toronto, Ontario
 Canadian Catholic School Trustees' Association
 Canadian Dental Association, Toronto, Ontario
 Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation, Toronto, Ontario
 Canadian Institute of Public Health Inspectors, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Canadian League of Rights (Saskatoon Branch) Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
 Canadian Public Health Association, British Columbia Branch, Burnaby, British Columbia
 Canadian Public Health Association, Toronto, Ontario
 Carder, Ralph, West Vancouver, British Columbia
 Carignan, Louise, Montréal, Québec
 Carrier, Jean, Thetford Mines, Québec
 Carson, William, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Chambly-Richelieu Protestant Board of School Commissioners, Richelieu, Québec
 Chamber of Commerce of the Province of Quebec, Montreal, Quebec
 Chambre de Commerce de la Province de Québec, Montréal, Québec
 Chapeskie, H. J., Barry's Bay, Ontario
 Checklin, G. A., Vancouver, British Columbia
 Chree, Anna, West Vancouver, British Columbia
 Clavelle, W., Montréal, Québec
 Coles, L. H., (Mrs.) Ottawa, Ontario
 Commissaires des écoles protestantes, Saint-Jean, Québec
 Commonwealth Society for Economic Education, Aldergrove, British Columbia
 Communist Party of Canada, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Conseil des écoles protestantes de Bedford, Bedford, Québec
 Conseil des écoles protestantes de Chambly-Richelieu, Richelieu, Québec
 Conseil des écoles protestantes de Cowansville, Cowansville, Québec
 Conseil des Territoires du Nord-Ouest, Yellowknife, Territoires du Nord-Ouest
 Conseil du Patronat du Québec, Montréal, Québec
 Conseil scolaire régional des Cantons de l'est, Sherbrooke, Québec
 Coolidge, R. B., Montréal, Québec
 Cooks-Ferry Indian Band, British Columbia
 Copeman, G. W., Langley, British Columbia
 Corbin, Frank, S. Nashwaaksis, New Brunswick
 Côté, Georges, Cté Montmorency, Québec
 Council of Employers of the Province of Quebec, Montreal, Quebec
 Council of the Northwest Territories, Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
 Cowan, A. W., Ottawa, Ontario
 Cowansville Protestant School Board, Cowansville, Quebec
 Creed, George E., Stoney Creek, Ontario
 Crosby, Emily, Ganges, British Columbia

Croyen, Peter, Newmarket, Ontario
 Crysler, Marylou, Font Hill, Ontario
 Curtis, Hugh A., Saanich, British Columbia
 Dafoe, G.A., Fort Coquitlam, British Columbia
 D'Amour, Joseph, Montréal, Québec
 Danis, Eugène J., Champs-neufs, Abitibi-Est, Québec
 Davidson, Douglas, Calgary, Alberta
 Davidson, Nora, Calgary, Alberta
 Davies, Alan T., Toronto, Ontario
 Davis, Pierre, Sudbury, Ontario
 Decaire, G.A., Ridgeway, Ontario
 Delparte, D., Abbotsford, British Columbia
 Derrah, Brian, Bristol, New Brunswick
 De Weerd, Henry-Eugene, Toronto, Ontario
 Dickinson-Starkey, P.J., Vancouver, British Columbia
 Dolan, Tom, Golden, British Columbia
 Donnelly, Robert, Calgary, Alberta
 Drummond, Elizabeth R., Vancouver, British Columbia
 Dumas, Albert, Québec, Québec
 Dunseath, P.S., Ottawa, Ontario
 Dunsmore, Lily N., Toronto, Ontario
 Early, Joe, White Rock, British Columbia
 Eastern Townships Regional School Board, Sherbrooke, Quebec
 Easton, Norman M. (Mr. and Mrs.) Regina, Saskatchewan
 École secondaire catholique centrale, Lethbridge, Alberta
 École secondaire Hill Park (classe d'histoire), Hamilton, Ontario
 Edgar, K.M. (Mrs.) Vancouver, British Columbia
 Elias, Mildred (Mrs.) Vancouver, British Columbia
 Environmental Crisis Operation
 Evans, M., Chilliwack, British Columbia
 Fédéralistes mondiaux du Canada (section de Winnipeg), Winnipeg, Canada
 Fédération canadienne des parents et des enseignants, Toronto, Ontario
 Fédération des parents et des enseignants de la Colombie-Britannique, Burnaby, Colombie-Britannique
 Fischer, Ernst, Oshawa, Ontario
 Fischer, Hugo, Ottawa, Ontario
 Ford, Arthur, London, Ontario
 Forget, Claude E., Montréal, Québec
 Forsyth, Smirle A., Amherst View, Ontario
 Fortin, L. Florian, St-Côme Linière, Québec
 Fowler, L.A., Calgary, Alberta
 Franco, Guilda, Ritzville, Washington, U.S.A.
 Franklin, Lottie, Fredericton, New Brunswick
 Frenette, Marc-André (Mme) Québec, Québec
 Garrie, Eva B., Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Galay, L., Victoria, British Columbia
 Gélinas, Claude, Laval, Québec
 Gemme, Andréa, St-Amable, Cte de Verchères, Québec
 George, Grace, Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Gibson, R.D., Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Glave, F.E., Hazeldean, Ontario
 Godin, Jean, Trois-Rivières, Québec
 Gohier, Noël, Montréal, Québec
 Graham, I.M., Montreal, Quebec
 Grand Orange Lodge du Canada, Toronto, Ontario
 Grand Orange Lodge of Canada, Toronto, Ontario
 Green, E. (Mrs.) Victoria, British Columbia
 Green, H.V., Victoria, British Columbia
 Group of students, Catholic General High School, Lethbridge, Alberta
 Dimnik, Martha
 Fauville, John
 Hartman, Ray
 Machaljewski, Joyce
 Miron, David
 Pittman, Delphine
 Previsch, Nick

Reilander, Roger
 Previsch, Nick
 Reilander, Roger
 Schefter, Annemarie
 Seaman, John
 Sefrer, Margie
 Group of Toronto Students:
 Groupe d'étudiants de Toronto:
 Apurtl, J.
 Furbush, Nancy
 Graham, Lloyd B.
 Ho, Emeline
 Hutchings, Mary
 MacLellan, Allan
 McQuade, Linda
 Partington, Karin
 Robbins, J. Robbins
 Sharkman, Janice
 Smiley, Jack
 Haas, T. L.
 Hall, Herbert L., Victoria, British Columbia
 Hamilton, Jock, Victoria, British Columbia
 Haney, Richard, Toronto, Ontario
 Hanson, W. J., Sharon, Ontario
 Hardy, Phyllis, Montreal, Quebec
 Harragin, Tennant, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Hauser, Daphne, Ottawa, Ontario
 Hea, H., Victoria, British Columbia
 Heaton, Joyce, Montreal, Quebec
 Heffler, Wendy, Ottawa, Ontario
 Henderson, R. C., Vancouver, British Columbia
 Hill Park Secondary School (History Class), Hamilton, Ontario
 Hollaman, E. H. (Mrs.) Don Mills, Ontario
 Holtslander, Dale, Edmonton, Alberta
 Hooper, W. H., Courtenay, British Columbia
 Hovell, Anne, Esquimalt, British Columbia
 Hubert, Kenneth, Ottawa, Ontario
 Hughes, C. P., Ottawa, Ontario
 Hull, Mary H. (Mrs.), Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
 Hunt, C. Warren, Calgary, Alberta
 Idington, John, Salmon Arm, British Columbia
 Institut canadien des inspecteurs d'hygiène publique, Vancouver, Colombie-Britannique
 Jardine, Robert, Calgary, Alberta
 Johnson, E. M. (Mrs.) Ottawa, Ontario
 Johnson, S. E., Ottawa, Ontario
 Jollow, Muriel, Brandon, Manitoba
 Jones, Hugh, Prince George, British Columbia
 Jones, R. M. P., DeWinton, Alberta
 Jones, Isabelle, Victoria, British Columbia
 Jones, Trevor, Victoria, British Columbia
 Jones, Winnifred, Calgary, Alberta
 Johnston, Louise Mary, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Juergens, D. H., Calgary, Alberta
 Kan, Leslie, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Kendrew, G. R., Sooke, British Columbia
 Kenney, William E., Calgary, Alberta
 Keys, G. E. (Mrs.) Regina, Saskatchewan
 Kingerlee, John (Mr. and Mrs.), Sidney, British Columbia
 Kovács, István, Toronto, Ontario
 Krauseneck, Hans, Clearwater, British Columbia
 Laatsch, H. K., Calgary, Alberta
 Lanthier, Aldéi, Montréal, Québec
 Latham, W. D. (Mrs.) Burnaby, British Columbia
 Lebeau, Jules, Montréal, Québec
 Lee, D. B., Sooke, British Columbia
 Leguerrier, René, Ottawa, Ontario
 Lemieux, Barney, White Rock, British Columbia
 Lexow, Kjell, Pointe Claire, Québec
 Ligue canadienne des droits (section de Saskatoon), Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

- Ligue monarchiste du Canada, (Section de Régina), Régina, Saskatchewan
 Lingley, Robert, Saint John West, New Brunswick
 Lutes, Allen W., Moncton, New Brunswick
 Lynch, Thomas, Whitbourne, Newfoundland
 Macdonald, R. S., Victoria, British Columbia
 Macfarlane, W. E., Beaconsfield, Québec
 MacIntosh, Freda, Toronto, Ontario
 MacKenzie, D., London, Ontario
 Mackenzie, D. D., Vancouver Island, British Columbia
 Mahaffy, Bryan, Ottawa, Ontario
 Mahood, H., Richmond, British Columbia
 Mallard, Gwen, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Manis, Martin, Montréal, Quebec
 Manning, Louis, Toronto, Ontario
 Marshall, Donald, Doe River, British Columbia
 Martin, J., Calgary, Alberta
 Martin, James, Montréal, Quebec
 Mather, R. W. (Mrs.) Nashwauksis, New Brunswick
 Matte, Ed, Prince George, British Columbia
 Mayer, Philippe, Montréal, Québec
 Meindl, Leopold, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Mika, John, Ottawa, Ontario
 Mizne, L. A., Montréal, Quebec
 Moase, Thomas, Toronto, Ontario
 Monarchist League of Canada, (Humboldt-Muenster Branch), Muenster, Saskatchewan
 Monarchist League of Canada, (Regina Branch), Regina, Saskatchewan
 Monarchist League of Canada, (Silton Branch), Silton, Saskatchewan
 Morton, James, West Vancouver, British Columbia
 Moscovitch, Marie, West Vancouver, British Columbia
 McArthur, Thomas C., Calgary, Alberta
 McCloskey, T. J., British Columbia
 McDougall, A. K., London, Ontario
 McEwen, A. (Mrs.) Regina, Saskatchewan
 McKenzie, Bruce J., Scarborough, Ontario
 McLaughlin, R. N., Toronto, Ontario
 McLeod, D. A., Regina, Saskatchewan
 McLeod, Elta R., Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario
 McLewin, Anna, Ottawa, Ontario
 McMurchy, R. C., Toronto, Ontario
 McMurrin, James, London, Ontario
 McNainy, E. (Mrs.) Coquitlam, British Columbia
 Naay Kens, J. J., Prince George, British Columbia
 Nadler, Joseph Y., Montréal, Quebec
 National Union of Christian Schools, British Columbia District, Burnaby, British Columbia
 Neal, James, Cultus Lake, British Columbia
 Neidermayer, Frances, Timmins, Ontario
 Neild, P. J., North Vancouver, British Columbia
 Neish, Elgin, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Nelligan, L. P., Montréal, Quebec
 Neulan, A.,
 Newell, R. H., Mellgrove, Ontario
 Noble, Madaline (Mrs.) Richmond, British Columbia
 Noquet, John, Montreal, Quebec
 North America Union Party, Toronto, Ontario
 O'Brien, Evelyn (Mrs.) Ottawa, Ontario
 O'Gorman, Denis K., Vancouver, British Columbia
 Olson, A. O., Toronto, Ontario
 Ontario Separate School Trustees' Association, Toronto, Ontario
 Opération environnement
 Opperman, Norman (Mr. & Mrs.) Toronto, Ontario
 O'Reilly, J. V., Prince George, British Columbia
 Osborn, E. M., Victoria, British Columbia
 Our Flags of the Century Association, Victoria, British Columbia
 Pacey, J., Vancouver, British Columbia
 Palmgren, Carl H., Victoria, British Columbia
 Parsons, Lucille, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Parti communiste du Canada, Vancouver, Colombie-Britannique
 Parti de l'union de l'Amérique du Nord, Toronto, Ontario
 Paul, L., Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
 Peachey, Edmund, Islington, Ontario
 Perkins, Harry Grant, Frobisher Bay, Northwest Territories
 Peterson, B. N., Calgary, Alberta
 Piché, Arthur, Québec, Québec
 Pinnell, John E., Lachine, Quebec
 Pitcairn, Brian, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
 Plante, Jean Alonzo, Toronto, Ontario
 Pond, William, Ottawa, Ontario
 Powell, C. E. (Miss) Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Protestant Board of School Commissioners of Bedford, Bedford, Quebec
 Protestant Board of School Commissioners, St. Johns, Quebec
 Protestant School Municipality of Chaleur Bay, New Carlisle, Quebec
 Protestant School Municipality of Pontiac County West, Campbells Bay, Quebec
 Protestant School Municipality of Trois-Rivières, Cap-de-la-Madeleine, Trois-Rivières, Québec
 Purdon, E. J. (Mrs.) Pouasson, Ontario
 Purkis, Walter L., Verdun, Quebec
 Quittner, J. K., Toronto, Ontario
 Racz, Frank, St. Thomas de Joliette, Quebec
 Reconfederation, Picton, Ontario
 Reconfédération, Picton, Ontario
 Reeves, W. F., Surrey, British Columbia
 Reid, W. C., Bowser, British Columbia
 Renaud, Leo J., Chatham, Ontario
 Riverim, George Henri, Arvida, Quebec
 Roberts, Gordon, Ottawa, Ontario
 Robson, John C., Toronto, Ontario
 Rudelsheim, J. L., North Vancouver, British Columbia
 Ruggles, Susan
 Ryder, S., Ottawa, Ontario
 Sarton, M. F., Campbell River, British Columbia
 Savasvuo, Peter, Toronto, Ontario
 Say, Vivian I. (Mrs.) Vancouver, British Columbia
 Scott, Douglas, Hamilton, Ontario
 Scott, Marjorie, Asbestos, Quebec
 Seafarers' International Union of Canada, Montreal, Quebec
 Seligman, A. L., Vancouver, British Columbia
 Shearwan, Marilyn E., Edmonton, Alberta
 Shelly, Reg., Vancouver, British Columbia
 Silbernagel, Jonathan, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Simpson, Henry, Timmins, Ontario
 Simpson, Lyslie, G. (Mrs.) Vancouver, British Columbia
 Sims, Esther C., Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Sinay, Jack, Montreal, Quebec
 Singer, Allan, Montreal, Quebec
 Skelton, Len, Victoria, British Columbia
 Skuce, R., Victoria, British Columbia
 Smart, Philip, Toronto, Ontario
 Smelt, Norman, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Smith, Douglas N., Drummondville, Québec
 Snedker, J. E., Regina, Saskatchewan
 Socialist Labor Party of Canada, Toronto, Ontario
 Society for Pollution and Environmental Control, Campbell River Branch, British Columbia
 Société pour le bien public et l'éducation dans le domaine de l'économie, Aldergrove, Colombie-Britannique
 Société pour vaincre la pollution, Montréal, Québec
 Soutter, D. (Miss) Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Spencer, J.A., Magrath, Alberta
 Spiridonakis, Basile G., Sherbrooke, Québec
 St. George, J.J., Deer Lake, Newfoundland/Terre-Neuve

Stephaniuk, Bernard, Wishart, Saskatchewan
 Stevens, John R., Burnaby, British Columbia/Colombie-Britannique
 Stewart, K.N. (Mrs.) Fernie, British Columbia
 Stewart, Patrick David, Victoria, British Columbia
 Stone, E. Georgia, Toronto, Ontario
 Stone, Ida K., Toronto, Ontario
 Storozuk, E., Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Stovel, W.D., Calgary, Alberta
 Stranack, R.S. (Mrs.) Ladner Delta, British Columbia/Colombie-Britannique
 Styles, Effie L., Vancouver, British Columbia/Colombie-Britannique
 Sullivan, K.H. (Mrs.) Ottawa, Ontario
 Symons, R.D., Siltou, Saskatchewan
 Symthies, R.E., Victoria, British Columbia
 Systems Research Group, Toronto, Ontario
 Talbot, W., Pointe Claire, Quebec
 Taylor, Sandra
 Tennant, W., Kamloops, British Columbia
 Terry, Ilace (Miss) Victoria, British Columbia
 Terry, Robin, Victoria, British Columbia
 Tetley, William, Montreal, Quebec
 Theckedath, George, Ottawa, Ontario
 Thomson, Donald, Victoria, British Columbia
 Thomson, Marion A. (Mrs.) Toronto, Ontario
 Thompson, Gordon L., Windsor, Ontario
 Thuillier, H.S., Victoria, British Columbia
 Tittley, Georges, Ottawa, Ontario
 Truman, Thomas, Hamilton, Ontario
 Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Union internationale des marins canadiens
 Union nationale des écoles chrétiennes, District de la

Colombie-Britannique, Burnaby, Colombie-Britannique
 United Empire Loyalists Association of Canada, Toronto, Ontario
 Villeneuve, Berthold, Jonquière, Québec
 Vickery, H. (Miss) Winnipeg, Manitoba
 "Voice of the Unborn" Association, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Wall, Jack, Calgary, Alberta
 Wardle, Thomas H., Scarborough, Ontario
 Watts, G. K., Lethbridge, Alberta
 Weiss, George, R., Beaupré, Québec
 Weninger, B., Lethbridge, Alberta
 Wensley, William K., Lac Vert, Saskatchewan
 Wertheimer, Leonard, Toronto, Ontario
 Wessel, H. (Mrs.) Monte Creek, British Columbia
 Westerhof, Wilma L. T. K., Toronto, Ontario
 Whitmore, B. G., Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Williams, Gordon D., Regina, Saskatchewan
 Wills, Harold A., Cochrane, Ontario
 Wilson, F. J. L., Victoria, British Columbia
 Wilson, Raymond T., Hamilton, Ontario
 Wintermeyer, G., Ottawa, Ontario
 Wisla, A., Vancouver, British Columbia
 Wolfe, Evan, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Woods, H. D., Fredericton, New Brunswick
 Woodward, E. F. (Mrs.) Little Fort, British Columbia
 World Federalists of Canada (Winnipeg Branch), Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Wozney, Stanley, Vancouver, British Columbia
 Wright, Conrad P., Ottawa, Ontario
 Wushke, Ralph C., Wapella, Saskatchewan
 Yaroslava, R., Alliston, Ontario
 Zuzens, Didzus, Winnipeg, Manitoba
 * * *

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 18 of the 2nd Session and Issues Nos. 1 to 94 of the 3rd Session*) is returned and a copy of the Minutes of Proceedings (*Issue No. 1*) of the present Session is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 4 to the Journals*).

And a point of order having been raised as to the Tabling of minority reports from Special and Standing Committees and questions of privilege having been raised in relation thereto;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank honourable Members of every party who, for the guidance of the Chair, have stated some sound views, I am sure, which I will try to take into consideration when giving a ruling on the point of order of the honourable Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin).

The honourable Member has indicated that he was rising on a point of order before concurrence in the report.

I wish to point out immediately that the matter has nothing to do with the approval of the report. A motion for concurrence in the report will be put forward in due time, I suppose, either by the chairman of the committee or another Member on his behalf or a Member speaking on behalf of the committee members.

We are now discussing the tabling of the report and we must take for granted that it has already been tabled and that it is now before the House.

If I understand correctly, the honourable Member for Charlevoix rose on a point of order because he would like to know whether minority reports can be tabled or should be concurred in at the same time as the majority report. No need to indicate to honourable Members that this would be an entirely new practice.

Members who have participated in this debate on procedure have referred to parliamentary practice in Australia. The honourable Member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) has referred to the procedure in Great Britain, but no precedent has been quoted to me to the effect that I could allow the submission of one or more minority reports.

Members have largely quoted, I admit, sections and precedents which carry weight in such cases. Paragraph 319 of the Fourth edition of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms has been quoted to this House: "The report of the committee must be signed by the Chairman. No other signature should be affixed to a report for the purpose of showing any division of opinion in the committee, nor can it be accompanied by any counter statement from the minority, as such is unknown in British parliamentary practice."

I would add, by the way, that it is also unknown in Canadian parliamentary practice.

I keep on quoting: "The Chairman only signs by way of authentication on behalf of the committee. He should sign even if he dissented with the majority of the committee. No minority report should be made to the House."

It should be noted that Bourinot refers to the fact that in certain circumstances, a minority report has been

attached as an appendix to the majority report of the committee.

It must be indicated also that the precedent quoted to justify this practice dates back to 1874. It might perhaps be useful if I were to read this quotation from the Fourth edition of Bourinot's. Here it is: "No signatures should be affixed to a report for the purpose of showing any division of opinion in the committee; nor can it be accompanied by any counter-statement or protest from the minority, as such a report is as unknown to Canadian as to English practice. When the chairman signs a report, it is only by way of authentication. In 1879, a report of a dissenting member was brought in and appeared in the votes, but attention having been called to the irregularity of the proceeding, this minority report was ordered not to be entered on the *Journals*. The rule with respect to such matters, however, has been more than once practically evaded by permitting a minority report to appear in the appendix to the report of the committee;".

This is where reference is made to a precedent dating back to 1874.

On the other hand, honourable Members, especially the honourable Member for St. Paul's (Mr. Wahn) and the honourable Member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) have stated that in recent years, especially in 1971, the report of the Committee on External Affairs and National Defence included the dissident or minority opinions of some members.

I find nothing in the precedents established by the House to prevent such a procedure. What the Standing Orders and parliamentary practice forbid is the tabling of minority reports. It is somewhat in the nature of an *obiter dictum* to suggest that a report may include dissident or minority opinions.

But what reaches us eventually is a single report, the majority report, and the report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence which was presented last year contained dissenting opinions of course but only one report was presented and no suggestion was made that the House should receive at the same time a second, third, or fourth minority report.

In view of the circumstances, I really cannot see how I could ignore this long parliamentary tradition and allow the honourable Member for Charlevoix, the honourable Member for Lafontaine (Mr. Lachance), the honourable Member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), in short all honourable Members who said that they had minority reports to present, to Table those minority reports.

In very eloquent terms, the honourable Member for Greenwood suggested that time has come to change the Standing Orders. It is possible. Some Members have said that time has come for Parliament to give members of a committee the opportunity of expressing their diverging points of view in a minority report. Perhaps, but unfortunately it is not up to the Chair to make such a decision.

The honourable Member for Greenwood and, I believe, the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) suggested it. The proposal is valid, interesting and could easily be studied by the Procedure and Organization Committee. Many times, I took the liberty of recommending that this committee examine some parliamentary practices. Here is one which I think could be usefully studied by the committee.

Having said that, I do not think I can comply with the honourable Member's request that the minority reports be now presented.

Mr. Groos, seconded by Mr. Wahn, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-171, An Act to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in scientific and industrial experiments, tests or training by recipients of grants from the Government of Canada, by agencies of the Government of Canada and by persons manufacturing or testing pharmaceutical or biochemical products for sale to the Government of Canada or to any of its agencies, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The Order being read for the report stage of Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. Baldwin, proposed to move,—That Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be amended by deleting from Clause 32 paragraph (a) subparagraphs (iii), (iv), (v) and paragraph (g).

And debate arising thereon;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

By unanimous consent, the House proceeded to the consideration of "Private Bills".

By unanimous consent, the Order being read for the report stage of Bill C-164, An Act to incorporate United Bank of Canada, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Haidasz, seconded by Mr. Blair, moved in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-164,

be amended by substituting the word "Unity" or "l'Unité" as the case may be, in the title thereof for the words "United" or "Unie" and elsewhere in the bill as required.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. Haidasz, seconded by Mr. Blair, Bill C-164, An Act to incorporate United Bank of Canada (Title changed to An Act to incorporate Unity Bank of Canada), as amended, was concurred in at the report stage.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Haidasz, seconded by Mr. Blair, moved,—That the said bill be read a third time and do pass.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly the said bill was read the third time and passed.

[Notices of Motions (Papers)]

Items numbered 2, 3 and 6 were allowed to stand and retain their position at the request of the government.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a description of the area which the federal government would like to see incorporated in the proposed second national park in Saskatchewan to be situated in the Val Marie-Killdeer area.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 17*).

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Consideration was resumed at the report stage of Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. Baldwin,—That Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be amended by deleting from Clause 32 paragraph (a) subparagraphs (iii), (iv), (v) and paragraph (g).

After further debate, by unanimous consent, the said motion was withdrawn.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. McCleave, proposed to move,—That Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be amended by adding in Clause 32 after the word "Act" in line 4 on page 31 the following:

"provided that any regulation made pursuant to any of the above paragraphs shall be subject to a negative resolution adopted by not less than the majority of the provinces both in number and in population at the first plenary session of first ministers of Canada and the provinces or of their respective finance ministers following the making of the said regulation."

And debate arising on a point of order in relation to the said proposed motion;

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unless other honourable Members wish to make submissions on the procedural point, the Chair is prepared to rule on the procedural acceptability of the motion put before the chamber for its consideration. As I indicated in my initial remarks I was not seriously concerned about the constitutional question of giving authority to a body outside of the federal authority, if I may use that term again. The honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), and I believe the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) did not disagree with him, said that this is a question of law, that is not the concern of the Chair. I raised it only in a preliminary fashion so that honourable Members would know I had it in mind and, if they felt I erred in that respect, they could argue that point.

The second point in my preliminary remarks concerned the substantive nature of the motion, and whether it was in fact beyond the purview of the clause of the bill that we have before us.

Again I do not think the President of the Treasury Board has a quarrel with the honourable Member for Edmonton West, and indeed I have no quarrel with the honourable gentleman in this respect, that there is no question but that it lies within the power of Parliament to provide for a review when it makes provision for the enactment of regulations. Of course it is within the authority of Parliament to provide for a review or check on those regulations. So, I do not have a concern with that.

My only concern was whether or not the check or the veto, if I may call it such, which is provided for in the motion before the Chamber, goes beyond the scope of the clause of the bill that the Chamber has before it. The honourable Member for Edmonton West took a stand

with respect to the Statutory Instruments Act, and I think he appeared to be critical of the government on that point. I am not going to base my decision on his argument in that respect. The President of the Treasury Board indicated that if the honourable Member for Edmonton West was chastising the government for its inaction in certain other areas, he should not use this particular vehicle. I agree with that.

That leaves me with the consideration of whether or not the motion before the chamber is of a substantive nature, that is, whether it goes beyond the scope of the clause that it purports to amend. It is quite a substantial change, but I am going to allow the motion because it does seem to me that while the authority respecting the veto may be substantially different than the power given to the governor in council, I would not want to say as to what degree or where a checking power, if I may use that term, a power of vetoing or checking the authority given to the governor in council goes beyond the authority contemplated in the bill. In other words, I would not want to say at what point the authority to provide a check or veto goes beyond the original thought of Parliament in enacting the clause of the statute. For those reasons I shall allow the amendment. The motion has been put to the chamber and it is not necessary for me to read it again unless hon. members wish me to do so. It is before the chamber for debate.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. McCleave,—That Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be amended by adding in Clause 32 after the word "Act" in line 4 on page 31 the following:

"provided that any regulation made pursuant to any of the above paragraphs shall be subject to a negative resolution adopted by not less than the majority of the provinces both in number and in population at the first plenary session of first ministers of Canada and the provinces or of their respective finance ministers following the making of the said regulation."

After further debate, by unanimous consent, the said motion was withdrawn.

On motion of Mr. Drury for Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Mahoney, the said bill, was concurred in at the report stage.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Drury for Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Mahoney, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. McCleave proposed to move in amendment thereto, —That Bill C-8 be not now read a third time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the action of the government in arranging by departmental directive for machinery to collect taxes for several provinces of which Parliament had not yet approved is contrary to established practice and without constitutional authority.

RULING BY MR. ACTING SPEAKER

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Laniel): Maybe I should tell the honourable Member at this point, before I put his amendment, that I have reservations with regard to it mainly because it appears to go beyond the purview of the bill which is before us. I might refer the honourable Member to citation 418 of Beauchesne which states: "The question for the third reading is put immediately after the report from the Committee of the Whole. All amendments which may be moved on a second reading of a bill may be moved on the third reading with the restriction that they cannot deal with any matter which is not contained in the bill."

Maybe it is an appropriate moment at which to invite the honourable Member's comments. The main point I wish to raise is that the amendment does not seem to meet all the requirements, particularly the one which says that an amendment should be relevant to the bill.

— — — — —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I am sure the honourable Member understands that he cannot ask the Chair to rule on the intention of an amendment. The Chair can rule only on the procedural acceptability of an amendment as such. To my mind, the terms of the present amendment appear to criticize the actions of the government. Honourable Members know that according to the rules of the House an amendment must relate to the contents of the bill. It can either refute the bill or must relate to something that is found in the provisions of the bill. I have already referred to the citation in Beauchesne that clearly provides that all amendments that may be moved on second reading of a bill may be moved on the third reading, with the restriction that they cannot deal with any matter which is not contained in the bill. If the honourable Member would also refer to the top of page 572 of Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition, he will see quite plainly provided: "As the debate on the third reading should be confined to the contents of the bill, reasoned amendments which raise matters not included in the provisions of the bill are not permissible."

In view of these two citations, it is clear that the honourable Member cannot ask the Chair to postpone its decision as to the acceptability of this amendment on the sole ground that it might be, in the mind of the honourable Member, a very important question. For these reasons I cannot accept the amendment.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Drury for Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr.

Mahoney,—That Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Rose for Mr. Gleave on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Gilbert, Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont), Hopkins, Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean) and Lessard (La-Salle) for Messrs. Burton, Leblanc (Laurier), Buchanan, Forget and Otto on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Harding for Mr. Gleave on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Deakon for Mr. Forget on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Messrs. Allmand, Smith (Saint-Jean), Benjamin and Forrestall for Messrs. Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay), Pringle, Mather and Danforth on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Messrs. Stewart (Cochrane), Caccia, Gendron, McBride and Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi) for Messrs. St. Pierre, Buchanan, Deakon, Murphy and Sulatycky on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Nielsen for Mr. Horner on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Forget for Mr. Duquet on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Howe for Mr. Moore on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MacInnis for Mr. McKinley on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont) for Mr. Howe on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

At 10.31 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 22

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, MARCH 17, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Gendron, seconded by Mr. Béchar, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-172, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Matte, seconded by Mr. Latulippe, moved,—That this House regrets that the government has not established consultative bodies with the provinces and municipalities, with a view to decentralizing monetary and fiscal policies in such a way as to permit each level of government to assume its own responsibilities in a manner less burdensome to the taxpayer.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the said motion expired.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Danforth for Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West) on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Nowlan for Mr. Ritchie on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Skoberg and Rowland for Messrs. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley) and Harding on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Burton for Mr. Gilbert on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Andras, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copies of Order in Council P.C. 1972-348 dated February 29, 1972, amending Part I of the Schedule to the Hazardous Products Act, pursuant to section 8(3) of the said Act, chapter H-3, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/160.

By Mr. Jamieson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Traffic Safety Report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 20 of the Motor Vehicle Safety Act, chapter 26, R.S.C., 1970, 1st Supplement. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/370.

At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until Monday at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 23

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, MARCH 20, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Gillespie, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Final Joint Press Release on the Canadian Scientific and Technological Mission to Japan, March 6-15, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/117.

Mr. Reid, seconded by Mr. Hymmen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-173, An Act to amend the British North America Act and the Canada Elections Act (retirement age of Members of the House of Commons), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following two Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 120—*Mr. Latulippe*

Are there still reserve regiments in the Canadian Armed Forces and, if so (a) how many (b) what is the name of each such regiment (c) what is the total strength of each (d) what was the average salary of each

member of the reserves for the year 1971?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/120.

No. 241—*Mr. Southam*

1. Under the Crop Insurance Act, what provinces have enacted enabling legislation?

2. By province, how many farmers received indemnities under this programme in 1971?

3. By province, what were the total indemnities paid to farmers under this programme in 1971?

4. By province, what crops were covered by the Crop Insurance Act in 1971?

5. By province, what were the chief causes of crop losses in 1971?

6. By province, what were the total premiums paid by farmers under the Plan?

7. By province, what amounts did the federal government contribute towards the premium costs?

8. By province, what amount did the federal government contribute towards the cost of administration of the Plan?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/241.

Mr. Béchard, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Mahoney,—That Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be now read a third time and do pass.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to a Committee of the Whole of Bill C-169, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act;

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to a Committee of the Whole.

And a point of order having been raised by the honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) concerning the procedure and practices of the House in relation to budgetary proposals.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I do not think honourable Members would want me to go into detailed references on the interesting point of order raised by the honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). The point he is making, I think, has been explained, and is supported to some extent by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

While the honourable Member for Edmonton West was speaking there was a thought going through my mind that perhaps he was not entirely right when he suggested that under the old rules there was a procedural requirement that there be a budget presentation. According to the advice or information that I have, there has never been such a requirement in the rules. There has been a practice, under the old rules, that there be a budget presentation, but there was nothing in the Standing Orders, as they existed then, requiring that a budget presentation be made.

With respect to the honourable Member's suggestion that it is a new procedure to have a ways and means bill, which is based on a presentation of a budget in a previous session, it has been brought to my attention that perhaps this has been done before, more particularly in the year 1962, where the index has a reference to a budget resolution passed in a previous session. This in itself is an indication that even in the year 1962 this procedure was followed.

It has also been brought to my attention that there was a ruling by then Mr. Speaker Lambert, which is reported at page 133 of the *Journals* for 1962, regarding

the requirement of whether ways and means legislation be preceded by a budget presentation. I am sure the honourable Member remembers the circumstances very well.

The only motion under the old rules was one to the effect that Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair. On those occasions no one knew whether there would be a budget presentation or not. That was the point which the honourable Member for Edmonton West, in his then capacity as Speaker of the House, made. He was perfectly right, and I agree with him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to get involved in debate with the honourable Member. I agree with the ruling which he made at that time, and I say that although the rules have been changed since then the principle continues the same, and there is still no procedural requirement for a budget presentation. There was none procedurally then for a bill effecting the ways and means resolution to be based on a budget presentation.

I appreciate the point made by the honourable Member for Edmonton West. It is the kind of difficulty which perhaps results from the drafting of the new rules as they are before us now. The honourable Member for Edmonton West, and his distinguished colleague, the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, are leading members of the committee on procedure, and they do from time to time consider some of these difficulties. This is one of the difficulties which they might like to look into some day.

Having said this, I would think that I would have to rule that the bill is now before us correctly from a procedural standpoint.

And debate arising on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-169, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, be now read a second time and be referred to a Committee of the Whole.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole.

And the House continuing in Committee;

At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker took the Chair.

[*Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)*]

(*Notices of Motions*)

Mr. Southam, seconded by Mr. Howe, moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should con-

sider the advisability of remitting to municipalities, pursuant to section 22 of the Financial Administration Act, all consumption or sales taxes paid or payable by or to be paid or payable by such municipalities, in the five years immediately preceding January 1, 1972 and in subsequent years commencing with that date, in respect of municipal equipment, otherwise exempt from such tax, but so taxed or liable to be so taxed by reason that such equipment has been or may be applied to any use as described in paragraph (c) of subsection (4) of section 27 of the Excise Tax Act.—(Notice of Motion No. 2).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

The House resumed consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bill C-169, An Act to amend the Income Tax

Act, which was reported without amendment and concurred in at the report stage.

Mr. Mahoney for Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Stanbury, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-169, be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of reconsidering Clause 2 thereof.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said proposed amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 7)

YEAS

Messrs.

Beaudoin,	Gauthier,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Rose,
Blackburn,	Gilbert,	North Centre),	Nystrom,	Rowland,
Broadbent,	Godin,	Lambert	Orlikow,	Saltsman,
Burton,	Harding,	(Bellechasse),	Peters,	Skoberg—20.
Dionne,			Rondeau,	

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Forrestall,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Major,	Roy (Laval),
Andras,	Gibson,	Humboldt),	Marceau,	Serré,
Béchar, d,	Gillespie,	Laniel,	Mazankowski,	Smith
Bell,	Guay	Leblanc (Laurier),	Murphy,	(Northumberland-
Blair,	(St. Boniface),	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Noël,	Miramichi),
Breau,	Guay (Lévis),	Lefebvre,	Nowlan,	Smith
Buchanan,	Guilbault,	Legault,	O'Connell,	(Saint-Jean),
Clermont,	Gundlock,	Lessard (LaSalle),	Olson,	Southam,
Comtois,	Hogarth,	Lind,	Pelletier,	Stafford,
Corriveau,	Howard (Okanagan	MacInnis (Cape	Penner,	Stanbury,
Crossman,	Boundary),	Breton-East	Perrault,	Sulatycky,
Davis,	Howe,	Richmond),	Portelance,	Sullivan,
Deachman,	Hymmen,	MacLean,	Pringle,	Trudel,
De Bané,	Isabelle,	Macquarrie,	Prud'homme,	Turner
Downey,	Jerome,	McCleave,	Reid,	(London East),
Dupras,	Lachance,	McCutcheon,	Richard,	Wahn,
Éthier,	Lajoie,	McKinley,	Ritchie,	Watson,
Faulkner,	Lambert	McQuaid,	Rochon,	Whelan,
Flemming,	(Edmonton West),	Mahoney,	Rock,	Whiting,
Forget,			Roy (Timmins),	Yanakis—88.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.10 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Forget, Leblanc (Laurier), Buchanan and Otto for Messrs. Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean), Thomas (Maison-

neuve-Rosemont), Hopkins and Lessard (LaSalle) on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. MacKay for Mr. Crouse on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Flemming for Mr. Hees on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Messrs. Mazankowski and Downey for Messrs. Stewart (Marquette) and MacDonald (Egmont) on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Broadbent for Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Orlikow for Mr. Broadbent on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Downey and Mazankowski for Messrs. MacDonald (Egmont) and MacInnis on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Gibson and Hymmen for Messrs. Cullen and Walker on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Broadbent for Mr. Burton on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Skoberg for Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Forrestall and Ritchie for Messrs. Mazankowski and Nowlan on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo), Legault and Sullivan for Messrs. Cafik, Robinson and Deakon on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Davis, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Report of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 5 of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry Act, chapter F-20, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/11.

By Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Governor of the Bank of Canada and Statement of Accounts certified by the Auditors, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 26(3) of the Bank of Canada Act, chapter B-2, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/65.

At 10.34 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 24

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Portelance, from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following vote listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Vote 1 relating to the Department of Labour.

Your Committee commends it to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issue No. 1*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said report recorded as Appendix No. 5 to the Journals).

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That speeches on the motion under the order Business of Supply be limited to fifteen minutes with the exception of the prime speakers who shall be limited to twenty minutes.

24960—14

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Harding, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—This House expresses the view that in order to protect and preserve our environment, immediate national standards for environmental quality must be set for air, water and land, it being clear that these standards must be set for all pollutants, that they must be enforced by the federal authorities, that low-cost loans must be available to municipalities and to certain industries to ensure no further delay in the building of sewage treatment plants and plant clean-up, and that an Environmental Council of Canada should be established without delay.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the motion expired.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Gleave and Howe for Messrs. Knight and Korchinski on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Guay (Lévis), Lessard (LaSalle), McCleave and Rock for Messrs. Caccia, Smith (Saint-Jean), Lundrigan and Thomas (Moncton) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Howe for Mr. Forrestall on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Sullivan for Mr. Guay (Lévis) on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Messrs. Lundrigan and Thomas (Moncton) for Messrs. McCleave and Rock on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Knight for Mr. Rowland on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Duquet and Pringle for Messrs. Smith (Saint-Jean) and Loiselle on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Messrs. Corriveau, Smith (Saint-Jean), Roy (Timmins) and Guay (St. Boniface) for Messrs. Lessard (LaSalle), Beer, Côté (Richelieu) and Crossman on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

At 10.25 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 25

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Leblanc (Laurier), from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Tuesday, March 7, 1972, your Committee has considered the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972 and commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said report recorded as Appendix No. 6 to the Journals).

Mr. Hales from the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

On March 9, 1972, your Committee received the following Order of Reference:

That the complaint of the Auditor General that the Government has failed to provide him with such

officers and employees as are necessary to enable him to perform his duties, as required by Section 56(4) of the Financial Administration Act, and his consequent failure to submit his Report in time, be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, and that the said Committee hear the Auditor General and other witnesses and report its recommendations thereon not later than March 29.

The Committee held four sittings to discuss this Order of Reference. At the first meetings held on March 14, 1972, Mr. A. M. Henderson, Auditor General of Canada, appeared as a witness, and on March 16 the Honourable C. M. Drury, President of the Treasury Board, appeared.

The Committee has found that Parliament has provided the funds for the number of staff required by the Auditor General. The problem seems to lie in the difficulty of obtaining and retaining qualified staff to fill the approved positions.

The reasons for these difficulties are complex and will require further consideration by the Committee.

It has been suggested by both the President of the Treasury Board and the Auditor General that the solution lies in an Auditor General's Act.

The Committee therefore requests from the House a further reference to draft recommendations for an Auditor General's Act.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (Issues Nos. 1 to 3 inclusive) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said report recorded as Appendix No. 7 to the Journals).

On motion of Mr. Jerome, seconded By Mr. Deachman, it was ordered,—That the Members of the House of Commons on the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments be Messrs. Allmand, Béchar, Blair, Brewin, Fairweather, Forest, Gibson, Laprise, Marceau, McCleave, Penner and Schumacher; and

That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours thereof.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following Question was made an Order of the House for a Return.

No. 202—*Mr. Gleave*

1. (a) What was the total cost of the advertising promotional programme concerning "Assured Mail" (b) in how many publications was the advertisement inserted?

2. (a) To date, what was the cost of the advertising programme for the current issue of Canada Savings Bonds (b) how long will the advertising campaign continue and what will be the final cost?

3. (a) What was the cost of the advertising programme in regard to the "New Design of Canada Cheques" (b) in how many publications was the advertisement inserted (c) what was the cost of each publication?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/202.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Return to the foregoing Order.

The Order being read for resuming debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Stanbury,—That Bill C-169, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, be now read a third time and do pass;

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

Th Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on National Resources

and Public Works of Bill C-7, An Act to amend the Explosives Act;

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), seconded by Mr. Gillespie, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Downey proposed to move,—That all the words after "That" be left out and the following substituted therefor:

"this House, affirming the principle that the criminal law of Canada extends only to anti-social acts and repudiating the principle of Bill C-7 that crimes include innocent acts as well as anti-social acts save only those acts exempted by regulation in the government's discretion, refers the subject-matter of Bill C-7 to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs."

RULING BY MR. ACTING SPEAKER

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Looking at the amendment moved by the honourable Member for Battle River (Mr. Downey) the Chair has some hesitation about the form of it. The amendment seems to do two things: it is a reasoned amendment partly opposing the bill and at the same time it is referring the subject-matter of the bill to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. To my mind, the amendment would have to be one or the other. By his amendment the honourable Member could oppose the bill or any part of the bill and leave it at that, or choose to refuse the second reading of the bill and at the same time refer the subject-matter of the bill to a standing committee.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), seconded by Mr. Gillespie,—That Bill C-7, An Act to amend the Explosives Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

And debate continuing;

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed the following bills, without any amendment:

Bill C-55, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.

Bill C-74, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.

Bill C-92, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.

Bill C-167, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Alkenbrack for Mr. Nowlan on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Lessard (LaSalle), Beer, Côté (Richelieu) and Crossman for Messrs Corriveau, Smith (Saint-Jean), Roy (Timmins) and Guay (St. Boniface) on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Goyer, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copy of a Contract between the Government of Canada and the Municipality of Charleswood, Manitoba, pursuant

to subsection 3 of section 20 of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, chapter R-9, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/270.

By Mr. Jamieson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Canadian Transport Commission for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 28(2) of the National Transportation Act, chapter N-17, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/105.

By Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copies of a document entitled "First Research Program of the Law Reform Commission of Canada", dated March, 1972, (E. Patrick Hartt, Esq.—Chairman) pursuant to section 18 of the Law Reform Commission Act, chapter 23, R.S.C., 1970, 1st Supplement. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/369.

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 26

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Gervais, from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following votes listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Vote 1 relating to the Department of Justice;

Vote 5 relating to the Law Reform Commission of Canada;

Vote 10 relating to the Tax Review Board.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 and 2*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said report recorded as Appendix No. 8 to the Journals*).

Mr. Hellyer, seconded by Mr. Stewart (Cochrane), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-174, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed the following bill to which the concurrence of this House is desired:

Bill S-3, An Act to change the names of the Territorial Court of the Yukon Territory and the Territorial Court of the Northwest Territories.—*Mr. Lang* (Saskatoon-Humboldt).

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That speeches on the motion under the order Business of Supply be limited to fifteen minutes with the exception of the prime speakers who shall be limited to twenty minutes.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Rynard, seconded by Mr. Hales, moved,—That this House condemns the government's failure to contribute to pensions, allowances and other benefits granted or administered by the government a yearly percentage increase corresponding to the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for Canada.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mr. Douglas, moved in amendment thereto,—That the

motion be amended by adding thereto immediately after the word Canada, the following words:

"and its failure to raise to adequate levels the basic amounts of all such pensions, allowances and benefits."

And debate arising thereon;

It being the Seventh and Final Allotted Day in the period ending March 26, 1972, at 9.45 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker interrupted the proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 58(10).

And the question being put on the said proposed amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 8)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Douglas,	Horner,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Peters,
Alexander,	Downey,	Knight,	MacKay,	Ricard,
Alkenbrack,	Fairweather,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacLean,	Ritchie,
Asselin,	Flemming,	North Centre),	Macquarrie,	Rock,
Barnett,	Forrestall,	Knowles (Norfolk-	McCleave,	Rodrigue,
Bell,	Fortin,	Haldimand),	McKinley,	Rose,
Bigg,	Gauthier,	Lambert	McQuaid,	Rowland,
Brewin,	Gleave,	(Bellechasse),	Mather,	Rynard,
Burton,	Godin,	Laprise,	Matte,	Simpson,
Cadiou,	Grills,	Lewis,	Muir,	Skoberg,
Code,	Gundlock,	MacDonald	Murta,	Southam,
Danforth,	Hales,	(Egmont),	Nesbitt,	Tétrault,
Dinsdale,	Harding,	MacInnis (Cape	Noble,	Winch—63.
Dionne,	Hees,	Breton-East		
		Richmond),		

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Deachman,	Guilbault,	McNulty,	Smith
Anderson,	Deakon,	Haidasz,	Mahoney,	(Northumberland-
Barrett,	De Bané,	Isabelle,	Marceau,	Miramichi),
Basford,	Drury,	Jerome,	Marchand	Smith
Bécharde,	Dubé,	Kaplan,	(Langelier),	(Saint-Jean),
Beer,	Dupras,	Lachance,	Munro,	Stafford,
Blair,	Duquet,	Laing	Noël,	Stewart
Blouin,	Éthier,	(Vancouver South),	Olson,	(Cochrane),
Borrie,	Faulkner,	Lajoie,	Ouellet,	Sulatycky,
Boulanger,	Forest,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Pelletier,	Thomas
Breau,	Forget,	Humboldt),	Pepin,	(Maisonneuve-
Caccia,	Francis,	Laniel,	Portelance,	Rosemont),
Chappell,	Gendron,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Pringle,	Tolmie,
Clermont,	Gervais,	Legault,	Reid,	Trudel,
Cobbe,	Gibson,	Lessard	Richardson,	Turner (Ottawa-
Comtois,	Gillespie,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Roberts,	Carleton),
Corbin,	Goyer,	Loiselle,	Robinson,	Walker,
Corriveau,	Gray,	Macdonald	Rochon,	Whelan,
Côté (Richelieu),	Groos,	(Rosedale),	Roy (Laval),	Whicher,
Côté (Longueuil),	Guay (St. Boniface),	MacEachen,	Serré,	Whiting,
Crossman,	Guay (Lévis),	McIlraith,	Sharp,	Yanakis—94.
Cyr,				

And the question being put on the main motion, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 9)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Dionne,	Harding,	MacInnis (Cape	Noble,
Alexander,	Douglas,	Hees,	Breton-East	Peters,
Alkenbrack,	Downey,	Horner,	Richmond),	Ricard,
Asselin,	Fairweather,	Knight,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Ritchie,
Barnett,	Flemming,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacKay,	Rock,
Bell,	Forrestall,	North Centre),	MacLean,	Rodrigue,
Bigg,	Fortin,	Knowles (Norfolk-	Macquarrie,	Rose,
Brewin,	Gauthier,	Haldimand),	McCleave,	Rowland,
Burton,	Gleave,	Lambert	McKinley,	Rynard,
Cadieu,	Godin,	(Bellechasse),	McQuaid,	Simpson,
Code,	Grills,	Laprise,	Mather,	Skoberg,
Danforth,	Gundlock,	Lewis,	Matte,	Southam,
Dinsdale,	Hales,	MacDonald	Muir,	Tétrault,
		(Egmont),	Murta,	Winch—62.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Deachman,	Guilbault,	McNulty,	Smith
Anderson,	Deakon,	Haidasz,	Mahoney,	(Northumberland-
Barrett,	De Bané,	Isabelle,	Marceau,	Miramichi),
Basford,	Drury,	Jerome,	Marchand	Smith
Bécharde,	Dubé,	Kaplan,	(Langelier),	(Saint-Jean),
Beer,	Dupras,	Lachance,	Munro,	Stafford,
Blair,	Duquet,	Laing	Noël,	Stewart
Blouin,	Éthier,	(Vancouver South),	Olson,	(Cochrane),
Borrie,	Faulkner,	Lajoie,	Ouellet,	Sulatycky,
Boulanger,	Forest,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Pelletier,	Thomas
Breau,	Forget,	Humboldt),	Pepin,	(Maisonneuve-
Caccia,	Francis,	Laniel,	Portelance,	Rosemont),
Chappell,	Gendron,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Pringle,	Tolmie,
Clermont,	Gervais,	Legault,	Reid,	Trudel,
Cobbe,	Gibson,	Lessard	Richardson,	Turner (Ottawa-
Comtois,	Gillespie,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Roberts,	Carleton),
Corbin,	Goyer,	Loiselle,	Robinson,	Walker,
Corriveau,	Gray,	Macdonald	Rochon,	Whelan,
Côté (Richelieu),	Groos,	(Rosedale),	Roy (Laval),	Whicher,
Côté (Longueuil),	Guay	MacEachen,	Serré,	Whiting,
Crossman,	(St. Boniface),	McIlraith,	Sharp,	Yanakakis—94.
Cyr,	Guay (Lévis),			

On motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, Supplementary Estimates (B) for the year ending March 31, 1972, laid before the House March 7, 1972, were concurred in.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Bill C-175, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1972, be now read a first time and be printed.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment and concurred in at the report stage.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, Interim Supply was concurred in, as follows:

That a sum not exceeding \$2,399,125,993.20 being the aggregate of—

(a) Three-twelfths of the total of all of the Items set forth in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, laid before the House of Commons on February 23, 1972, \$2,224,679,688.75.

(b) An additional eight-twelfths of the total amount of Consumer and Corporate Affairs Item 25, relating to the Prices and Incomes Commission, (Schedule A) of the said Estimates, \$312,666.64.

(c) An additional five-twelfths of the total amount of Finance Item 20, relating to the Department of Insurance, and Treasury Board Item 10 (Schedule B) of the said Estimates, \$26,150,416.65.

(d) An additional three-twelfths of the total amount of Energy, Mines and Resources Item 25, relating to the Atomic Energy Control Board, Manpower and Immigration Item 10, Transport Items 40, 50 and 85 and Treasury Board Item 5 (Schedule C) of the said Estimates, \$86,819,000.00.

(e) An additional two-twelfths of the total amount of Finance Item 5 and Manpower and Immigration Item 5 (Schedule D) of the said Estimates, \$51,113,000.00.

(f) An additional one-twelfth of the total amount of External Affairs Item L40, relating to the Canadian International Development Agency, Indian Affairs and Northern Development Item L60, Post Office Item 5, Privy Council Item 1, Secretary of State Item 70, relating to the National Arts Centre Corporation, Supply and Services Item 10, and Transport Items 65, relating to the Atlantic Pilotage Authority, 90, relating to the Laurentian Pilotage Authority, and 115, relating to the Pacific Pilotage Authority, (Schedule E) of the said Estimates, \$10,051,221.16;

be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Bill C-176, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1973, be now read a first time and be printed.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment and concurred in at the report stage.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, without any amendment.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Moore, Korchinski and Knight for Messrs. Howe, Mazankowski and Rose on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Burton and Benjamin for Messrs. Broadbent and Saltzman on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Deakon for Mr. Pringle on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Sulatycky for Mr. Stewart (Cochrane) on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Brewin for Mr. Rose on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley) for Mr. Skoberg on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Whelan, Whicher, Caccia, Clermont, Groos, Cobbe and Corriveau for Messrs. Badanai, Gibson, Haidasz, Isabelle, St. Pierre, Hymmen and Langlois on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Richardson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Capital Budget of the Royal Canadian Mint, for the period ending December 31, 1972, pursuant to section 70(2) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970, together with Order in Council P.C. 1972-342, dated February 24, 1972, approving same. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/176A.

By Mr. Richardson,—Capital Budget of the Canadian Arsenals Limited, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, pursuant to section 70(2) of the Financial Admin-

istration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970, together with Order in Council P.C. 1972-341, dated February 24, 1972, approving same. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/85A.

By Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Annual Report on the Administration of the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 35, chapter 25, R.S.C., 1970, 1st Supplement. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/173.

At 10.27 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 27

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, MARCH 24, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Howard (Skeena) for Mr. Blackburn, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-177, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) for Mr. Skoberg, seconded by Mr. Howard (Skeena), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-178, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (labour disputes), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mrs. MacInnis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-179, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (maternity benefits), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The following Bill from the Senate was read the first time and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House:

Bill S-3, An Act to change the names of the Territorial Court of the Yukon Territory and the Territorial Court of the Northwest Territories.—Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt).

Mr. Faulkner, Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Report of the Evaluation Task Force entitled "Opportunities for Youth '71", dated February, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-4/204.

Introduction of Bills having been called, as follows:

Mr. Gilbert—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971".

Mr. Rose—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (Indian reserve rights)".

Mr. Harding—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (no tax at source)".

Mr. Peters—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (holiday pay)".

Mr. Peters—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (retirement benefit)".

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act (benefits at time of retirement)".

Mr. Howard (Skeena)—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (*justitia pro societas*)".

And a point of order having been raised by Mr. Speaker in that the said bills appeared to contain financial

provisions, the bills were allowed to stand until the next sitting of the House.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs of Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children;

The honourable Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), raised a point of order to the effect that since another bill purporting to amend the Income Tax Act was pending in the Senate, it would be irregular to proceed with Bill C-170 as it too purported to amend the Income Tax Act.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: May I begin by referring to the well known rule to which the honourable Member for St. John's East alluded. The long established practice of the House says that the House should not be asked to pronounce itself on a question in the same session on which the House has already decided or expressed itself, either by negative or positive vote. That rule, of course, applies to legislation which is proposed to the House within a single session. If a particular item of legislation is proposed to the House on which there is a decision, either in favour or against, it is against the rules and long established practice of this Parliament and other parliaments to ask that the House decide again the same question or reconsider the same legislative proposal in the same session. However, so far as I know, no decision has been taken by this House in the current session, which began a few days ago, which would preclude anyone from proposing legislation of the nature before us at present. May I also indicate to honourable Members that there is nothing wrong procedurally with bringing forward two legislative proposals dealing with the same subject. If honourable Members will look at our parliamentary papers they will see that on many occasions, and almost at any time, a number of legislative proposals were before the House dealing with the same subject. Of course, once a decision has been reached on one of those legislative proposals, then the House has decided and, within the same session, and this does not apply to the following session, it would be irregular to ask the House to look at the same legislative proposal in order that there might be a new or renewed debate. That might lead us into the strange situation in which, within the same session, the House might reach two decisions on that proposal, one being contrary to the other. That is the logic behind the long standing practice and rule to which the honourable Member alluded. I do not think it is possible for the Chair to agree that this very valid rule should be extended to the point where it would preclude the consideration of the bill now before us.

Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

[At 4.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

By unanimous consent, order numbered one was allowed to stand at the request of the government.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs of Bill C-10, An Act to restrain the use of tobacco;

Mr. Mather, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Loiselle, Rochon, Breau and Caccia for Messrs. Guilbault, LeBlanc (Rimouski), Prud'homme and Osler on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Messrs. Badanai, Gibson, Haidasz, Isabelle, St. Pierre, Hymmen and Langlois for Messrs. Whelan, Whicher, Caccia, Clermont, Groos, Cobbe and Corriveau on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Dionne for Mr. Tétrault on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Basford, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Central Mortgage and Housing Cor-

poration, together with a Statement of the Accounts certified by the Auditors, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 33(3) of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act, chapter C-16, and section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/108.

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Return to an Order of the House, dated March 16, 1972, for a copy of a description of the area which

the federal government would like to see incorporated in the proposed second national park in Saskatchewan to be situated in the Val Marie-Killdeer area.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 17*).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/17.

At 5.00 o'clock p.m. Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until Monday at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 28

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, MARCH 27, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Reid, from the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

On March 15, 1972, your Committee received the following Order of Reference:

That the subject-matter of the refusal of the Public Service Commission to grant leave to Miss Anne Booth, a lawyer with the C.R.T.C., to seek a political nomination, be referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Your Committee heard several witnesses under the above reference, the Chairman of the Canadian Radio Television Commission, Mr. Pierre Juneau and Counsel, Mr. John Lawrence, and senior representatives from the Public Service Commission, Mr. Charles Lussier, Commissioner, and Mr. Jean Charron, Assistant Director General, Staffing Branch. We would like to express our thanks to these individuals for making themselves available on short notice to accommodate the Committee. It was not felt necessary to call Miss Booth as the facts of the case were not in dispute, and the refusal of the Public Service Commission to grant permission to her to have leave of absence to be a candidate in a forthcoming nomination meeting to select a candidate for the forth-

coming election was a judgment on the sensitivity of the position she holds. She advised your Committee that she was prepared to appear but preferred not to do so.

The Public Service Employment Act (1967), Section 32 and its subsections govern this case, in particular Section 32(3):

"Notwithstanding any other Act, upon application made to the Commission by an employee the Commission may, if it is of the opinion that the usefulness to the Public Service of the employee in the position he then occupies would not be impaired by reason of his having been a candidate for election as a member described in paragraph (a) of subsection (1), grant to the employee leave of absence without pay to seek nomination as a candidate and to be a candidate for election as such a member, for a period ending on the day on which the results of the election are officially declared or on such earlier day as may be requested by the employee if he has ceased to be a candidate."

Miss Booth applied for leave under Section 32(3) of the Public Service Employment Act and was refused. As there was no appeal provision provided, she indicated by letter to the Public Service Commission that she would continue to seek the nomination. The Chairman of the

C.R.T.C. then suspended her, pending discharge, as she was in violation of an order of the Public Service Commission.

The legislation calls for the Public Service Commission to exercise its judgement as to what positions in the Public Service would be "impaired" by reason of a person occupying that position having been a candidate for election. Evidence was presented by both the Chairman of the C.R.T.C. and the representatives from the Public Service Commission that the position held by Miss Booth was one which would be impaired in this sense. We do not disagree with the way in which the legislation was interpreted in this case. We do find, however, that the procedures, both in the Act and those of the Public Service Commission are deficient.

Under the existing legislation, there are a number of problems brought to light in this example. There is no indication of what is, or may be, a sensitive position under Section 32(3) of the Public Service Employment Act. Consequently, each application has been dealt with on an *ad hoc* basis, with the result over a period of time developing a set of rough and ready guidelines. It was made clear by representatives of the Public Service Commission that it is the position which is evaluated, not the person making the application. No attempt had apparently been made to develop comprehensive guidelines by the Public Service Commission.

Your Committee feels that policy derived from *ad hoc* decisions is not a completely satisfactory practice. While representatives from the Public Service Commission admitted that there were some guidelines in certain categories of the Public Service, there were none for the Public Service as a whole. In addition, public servants were not informed as to what positions were "sensitive" in this context.

We do not believe that this practice should be continued. Guidelines with an appeal provision ought to be created and circulated to public servants so that they would know in advance what political role they would be able to play in their future as a result of having accepted a "sensitive" position. It was suggested, as an example, that those public servants excluded from the collective bargaining process because of the "sensitivity of their positions", be also excluded from presenting themselves as candidates for election because of the "sensitivity of their positions". We recognize that this is also a rough and ready guideline, and so we also recommend an appeal provision be attached as well.

Concerning appeal provisions, the Public Service Employment Act does provide an opportunity for creating appeal provisions through Sections 33, 34, and 35, which outline the powers of the Governor-in-Council to make regulations. In addition, Section 7 of the Financial Administration Act, which outlines the powers and functions of Treasury Board in relation to personnel management, would also seem to provide an opportunity to establish

an appeal procedure for situations like this. Changes to Section 32(3) might also be seriously considered.

We recognize the excellent record of the Public Service Commission in approving 44 of some 48 cases in which it has had to make a decision. However, it is positions that are under consideration, not individuals, and it seems to us that specific guidelines ought to be developed and made available to public servants.

Your Committee feels that the procedures under which the Public Service Commission dealt with Miss Booth are unsatisfactory. Miss Booth had no avenue of appeal open to her.

Your Committee is of the opinion that Parliament ought to re-examine the whole question of the rights of public servants to participate in the political process.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 3 inclusive*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said report recorded as Appendix No. 9 to the Journals*).

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: Last week, a number of bills were proposed for introduction to the House. The Chair expressed reservations about certain procedural aspects of those bills. While three were accepted for introduction after serious consideration, seven were then held in abeyance. On Friday last, honourable Members were given an opportunity to express views on a point of order which queried whether these bills might not affect the financial initiative of the Crown. A number of Members participated in the interesting procedural debate and I have now had time to study their arguments.

The honourable Member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) suggested that the bills in question proposed to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act and argued that they do not infringe upon the financial initiative of the Crown. The honourable Member suggested that if in fact all these bills or any of them are found by the Chair to affect the Crown's prerogative in this respect, the rule should be disregarded as being archaic. The honourable Member will appreciate I am sure that the Chair can hardly be expected to disregard a rule that is so fundamental. If in respect of any of these bills the Chair is convinced that the financial initiative of the Crown is in fact affected, it has no alternative but to set them aside. That is the conclusion which I have reached, in connection with three of the seven bills in question.

The bill standing in the name of the honourable Member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) purports to be an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. In fact it is a bill to amend the Income Tax Act. Clause (1) repeals section 158(2) of the Unemployment Insurance Act, but

clause 158(2) repeals section 10(1)(h) of the Income Tax Act so that in fact clause (1) of this bill should not set out that it repeals 158(2) of the Unemployment Insurance Act but that it repeals section 10(1)(h) of the Income Tax Act.

The Unemployment Insurance Act says that benefits are taxable but the purpose of the bill is to make benefits non-taxable and to make workmen's compensation also non-taxable.

This to my mind is purely taxation legislation and is not acceptable unless initiated by the Crown.

The bill standing in the name of the honourable Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) also purports to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act while in fact in my view it is an amendment to the Income Tax Act. The purpose of the bill according to the explanatory note is to make unemployment insurance non-taxable when the benefits are received by Indians living on a Reserve. This of course affects the taxing initiative of the Crown and is out of order.

I have the same reservations concerning a bill standing in the name of the honourable Member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding). That bill proposes to change the method of payment of that part of claimants' benefits which is to be deducted at the source as taxable income. This again to my way of thinking deals clearly with tax legislation and as such is irregular unless proceeded upon the initiative of the Crown.

I have extremely serious reservations about the four remaining bills. Generally speaking these bills tend to increase the benefits payable under the terms of the Unemployment Insurance Act or to extend the period during which benefits might be payable under the law.

The question is whether legislation providing for such additional payments affects the financial initiatives of the Crown and requires as a condition precedent the Recommendation of the Crown. The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has argued that amendments have been allowed where the purpose was to relieve individuals of taxation rather than to impose a tax on someone else. I do not disagree with those rulings which were made in committee; I point out, however, that they were amendments and not new initiatives as in the present case. Citation 265 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition is the authority to establish that distinction. I am more impressed by the argument advanced by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and other honourable Members that the moneys required for the payment of proposed, extended benefits would not come out of the consolidated revenue fund and that they would not in any way affect the balance of ways and means. It is certainly a moot question whether these legislative proposals would in fact, one way or another, directly or indirectly, impose an additional burden on the public treasury and thus infringe upon the financial initiative of the Crown. One might well wonder whether government legisla-

tion tending to alter the benefits payable under the Act or perhaps tending to shift the burden from one group of contributors to the other should not be accompanied by the usual recommendation. I somewhat suspect that some honourable Members in this House would insist that this kind of legislation, if it were sponsored by the government, should be accompanied by a recommendation.

At the same time there are precedents, particularly in British parliamentary practice, which tend to indicate that such legislative proposals, because they do not, strictly speaking, impose a tax or impost as referred to in Standing Order 62, are outside the rule which protects the financial initiative of the Crown.

Because of the difficulty in interpreting the statute which these bills propose to amend; and because these bills, if they had been included in the original group filed at the opening of the session, would now be before the House along with all the others. I feel it would be fair to give the sponsors of these four bills the benefit of the doubt. The conclusion would be that the bills sponsored by the honourable Member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the honourable Member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) would be acceptable for submission to the House at this time. However, I have an additional reservation regarding the bill standing in the name of the honourable Member for Skeena, and this has not to do with his use of Latin in his explanatory note but, rather, with another aspect of the explanatory note. It has been ruled that such notes ought to be an explanation and not an argument. The mover of the bill cannot introduce in his explanatory note the speech or arguments he might want to present on second reading. Somehow, I feel that that is what the honourable Member for Skeena has attempted in his explanatory note, which, to some extent, is poetry. It sounds lyrical to the Chair. I strongly urge the honourable Member to make it conform more with existing practice and the form that is usual for such explanatory notes. That is the only reservation I would have in connection with this bill. I hope that the honourable Member will find it possible to make the necessary correction, perhaps in consultation with learned parliamentary counsel, after which the bill could be introduced. The other three bills standing in the name of the honourable Member for Timiskaming and the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre can be introduced at this time.

Mr. Peters, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-180, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (holiday pay), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Peters, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-181,

An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (retirement benefits), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mr. Howard (Skeena), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-182, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, (benefits at time of retirement), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The Text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to amend the Canada Labour Code respecting industrial relations; to continue the Canada Labour Relations Board and provide for the tenure, salary and expenses of its members; to provide that the Board may establish such offices in Canada as it deems necessary; to provide for the remuneration and expenses of members of the Board in regard to matters commenced prior to this Part coming into force and completed under the provisions of the former Act; to provide for Industrial Inquiry Commissions and for conciliation boards and for the remuneration and expenses of their members; to provide, in the event they are not public servants, for the remuneration and expenses of conciliation officers, conciliation commissioners and of every other person who functions under Part V of the Act at the request of the Minister; to provide that the Governor in Council may in certain circumstances deem a person appointed under Part V to be employed in the Public Service for the purposes of the Public Service Superannuation Act; to provide for witness fees and allowances to persons summoned to attend as a witness in any proceeding taken under Part V of the Act; to provide, when there is substantial uniformity with this Part, for an agreement with a province regarding the administration of the provincial legislation and for the payment to the Government of Canada for expenses incurred thereby; and to provide for consequential and related provisions in connection with the administration of Part V of the said Act.

Mr. Groos, seconded by Mr. Whelan, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-184, An Act respecting the reporting of marine traffic off the west coast of Canada,

which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Notices of Motions)

Mr. McGrath, seconded by Mr. Marshall, moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of rescinding Order No. R.2673 of July 3, 1968 of the Canadian Transport Commission which gave authority to Canadian National Railways to discontinue rail passenger service in Newfoundland.—(Notice of Motion No. 3).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And debate continuing;

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to "Motions".

On motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Olson, it was ordered,—That the Standing Committee on Public Accounts be authorized to prepare a draft bill concerning the office, functions and powers of the Auditor General.

On motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Olson, it was ordered,—That the question of radio and television broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and its committees, including the legal, procedural and technical aspects thereof, and the evidence collected by the Committee during the past session in relation to these matters, be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.02 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Barnett for Mr. Howard (Skeena) on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Barnett for Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley) on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Messrs. Fairweather and Mather for Messrs. Howe and Knight on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Nowlan and Danforth for Messrs. Murta and Downey on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

At 10.27 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 29

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson, moved,—That when this House adjourns on Wednesday, March 29, 1972, it shall stand adjourned until Thursday, April 13, 1972, provided always that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the Government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time;

And that, in the event of Mr. Speaker being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker or the Deputy Chairman of Committees shall act in his stead for the purpose of reconvening the House.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Diplomatic Instruments, as follows:

(1) Exchange of Notes between the Government of Canada and the Government of Denmark concerning

Fisheries Relations between the two Countries, Ottawa, March 27, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/100.

(2) Agreement between Canada and France on their mutual Fishing Relations, Ottawa, March 27, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/107.

(3) Exchange of Notes between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United Kingdom concerning Fisheries Relations between the two Countries, Ottawa, March 27, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/111.

(4) Exchange of Notes between the Government of Canada and the Government of Portugal concerning Fisheries Relations between the two Countries, Ottawa, March 27, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/109.

Mr. Macdonald, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Telex, dated March 27, 1972, addressed by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to Canadian Copper Producers. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/4.

Mr. Peters for Mr. Howard (Skeena), seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-185, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (*justitia pro societas*), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Barnett for Mr. Howard (Skeena), seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-186, An Act to amend the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

By unanimous consent, the Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of Bill C-78, An Act respecting the use of the expression "Parliament Hill";

Mr. McIlraith, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And debate arising thereon;

By unanimous consent, the said bill was read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment and concurred in, read the third time and passed.

By unanimous consent, the Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of Bill C-172, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act;

Mr. Gendron, seconded by Mr. Dupras, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And debate arising thereon;

By unanimous consent, the said bill was read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment and concurred in, read the third time and passed.

By unanimous consent, the Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration of Bill C-180, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (holiday pay);

Mr. Peters, seconded by Mr. Howard (Skeena), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And debate continuing;

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed the following bills, without any amendment:

Bill C-164, An Act to incorporate Unity Bank of Canada.

Bill C-169, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.01 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Murta for Mr. Korchinski on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont) for Mr. Haidasz on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Saltsman for Mr. Benjamin on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. Korchinski and Murta for Messrs. Danforth and Flemming on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. Cullen, Blouin, Code and Schumacher for Messrs. McNulty, Goode, Comeau and Lundrigan on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Messrs. McCutcheon and Noble for Messrs. Bigg and McQuaid on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. McGrath for Mr. Howe on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Lundrigan for Mr. McCleave on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Schumacher for Mr. Alkenbrack on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Hymmen for Mr. Sullivan on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Leblanc (Laurier) for Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski) on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Gibson for Mr. Legault on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Harries for Mr. Duquet on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Rochon for Mr. Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont) on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Loisel for Mr. Leblanc (Laurier) on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Trudeau, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Summary of Orders in Council passed during the month of December, 1971. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/362.

By Mr. Chrétien, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Copy of Ordinances, chapters 1 to 9, assented to January 28, 1972, pursuant to section 16(1) of the Northwest Territories Act, chapter N-22, R.S.C., 1970, together with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1972-507, dated March 14, 1972, approving same.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/200.

By Mr. Jamieson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Statement of Wharf Revenue Receipts and Statements of Harbour Dues for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 14 of the Government Harbours and Piers Act, chapter G-9, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/261.

By Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Tax Review Board, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 17 of the Tax Review Board Act, chapter 11, Statutes of Canada 1970-1971-1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/297.

By Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 46 of the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, chapter C-3, R.S.C., 1970, together with Financial Statements. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/78.

At 10.21 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 30

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Speaker communicated to the House the following letter:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
OTTAWA

29 March, 1972.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Gérard Fauteux, P.C., Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 29th day of March, at 5.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

LOUIS-FRÉMONT TRUDEAU,
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General.

The Honourable

The Speaker of the House of Commons,
Ottawa.

24960—16½

Mr. Gillespie for Mr. Pepin, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Report entitled "Private and Public Investment in Canada—Outlook 1972, and Regional Estimates". (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/213.

Mr. Rowland, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-187, An Act to amend the Small Loans Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Rowland, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-188, An Act to amend the Canada Pension Plan, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to "Motions".

On motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson, it was ordered,—That the House shall adjourn at 1:00 p.m. on Friday, April 14, 1972;

And that the Address of the President of the United States of America, Mr. Richard M. Nixon, to be delivered on Friday, April 14, 1972, before the Members of the Senate and of the House of Commons, together with all introductory and related speeches, be included in that day's House of Commons debates as an Appendix and thus form part of the records of this Parliament.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration of Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code;

Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. Pelletier, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

And debate arising thereon;

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed the following Bills:

Bill C-175, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1972.

Bill C-176, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1973.

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed Bill C-172, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, without any amendment.

A Message was received from the Right Honourable Gérard Fauteux, P.C., Chief Justice of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General desiring the immediate attendance of the House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker went with the House to the Senate Chamber;

And being returned;

Mr. Speaker reported that when the House did attend the Right Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, the Right Hon-

ourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

Bill C-55, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.—Chapter No. 3.

Bill C-74, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.—Chapter No. 4.

Bill C-92, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.—Chapter No. 5.

Bill C-167, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.—Chapter No. 7.

Bill C-172, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.—Chapter No. 6.

Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act.—Chapter No. 8.

Bill C-169, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.—Chapter No. 9.

Bill C-164, An Act to incorporate Unity Bank of Canada.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had addressed the Right Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR:

"The Commons of Canada have voted Supplies required to enable the Government to defray certain expenses of the public service.

"In the name of the Commons I present to Your Honour the following Bills:

'An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service, for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1972.'—Bill C-175, Chapter No. 1,

'An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service, for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1973.'—Bill C-176, Chapter No. 2.

"To which Bills I humbly request Your Honour's Assent."

Whereupon, the Clerk of the Senate, by Command of the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, did say:

"In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her Loyal Subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these Bills."

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Haidasz for Mr. Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont) on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Forest for Mr. Cobbe on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Andras, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Report of the Custodian of Enemy Property for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 3 of the Trading with the Enemy (Transitional Powers) Act, chapter 24, Statutes of Canada, 1947. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/118.

By Mr. Drury, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on the Administration of the Public Service Superannuation Act, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to sections 36 and 49 of the said Act, chapter P-36, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/220.

By Mr. Drury, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Report on the administration of the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 11 of the said Act, chapter 43, R.S.C., 1970, 1st Supplement. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/366.

By Mr. Goyer, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copy of a Contract between the Government of Canada

and the Municipality of Souris, Prince Edward Island, pursuant to subsection 3 of section 20 of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, chapter R-9, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/273.

By Mr. Macdonald, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the National Energy Board for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 91 of the National Energy Board Act, chapter N-6, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/188.

By Mr. Pepin, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of Operations under the Export and Import Permits Act for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 26 of the said Act, chapter E-17, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/137.

By Mr. Richardson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of Polymer Corporation Limited, including its Accounts and Financial Statements, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/208.

By Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of Operations under the Bretton Woods Agreements Act and the International Development Association Act, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 7 of the first-mentioned Act, chapter B-9, R.S.C., 1970, and section 5 of the latter Act, chapter I-21, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/74.

At 6.09 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until 2.00 o'clock p.m., Thursday, April 13, 1972, pursuant to Order made Tuesday, March 28, 1972.

No. 31

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That sixty minutes be allotted to the Oral Question period this day;

And that, notwithstanding the first paragraph of the Special Order relating to the business of the House on April 14, 1972, made on March 29, 1972, when the House adjourns this day, it shall stand adjourned until Monday, April 17, 1972 at 2 o'clock p.m.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. Pelletier,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

[Notices of Motions (Papers)]

Items numbered 2, 3 and 6 were allowed to stand and retain their position at the request of the government.

(Public Bills)

Orders numbered 1 to 4 inclusive, were allowed to stand at the request of the government.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications of Bill C-14, An Act respecting boating safety;

Mr. Mather, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. Pelletier,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be now read a second

time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Orange for Mr. Gendron on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Basford, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Revised Capital Budget of the National Capital

Commission for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 70(2) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970, as approved by Order in Council P.C. 1972-632, dated March 30, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/182.

By Mr. Marchand, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on the Operation of the Regional Development Incentives Act for the period March 1 to March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 16 of the said Act, chapter R-3, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/324.

By Mr. Olson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Canadian Livestock Feed Board for the crop year ended July 31, 1971, pursuant to section 22 of the Livestock Feed Assistance Act, chapter L-9, R.S.C., 1970, including its Accounts and Financial Statement. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/94.

By Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on the Operations under Part II of the Export Credits Insurance Act, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 27 of the said Act, chapter 105, R.S.C., 1952. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/139.

At 10.18 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until 2.00 o'clock p.m., Monday, April 17, 1972, pursuant to Order made earlier this day.

No. 32

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Agreement between Canada and the United States of America on Great Lakes Water Quality. Ottawa, April 15, 1972. In force, April 15, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/141.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following seven Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 10—*Mr. Ryan*

1. Which Crown corporations and other emanations of the Crown in the right of Canada employ or retain independent accountants and/or firms of accountants to service or audit their accounts?

2. What are the names of such accountants or firms of accountants who have serviced or audited each of such corporations and emanations in the past five fiscal years and what payments have been made to each of them by such corporations, emanations or the government in each of such fiscal years?

3. What payments will be made to each of them for the current fiscal year?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/10.

No. 92—*Mr. Laprise*

Since the coming into force of the Manpower Mobility Programme, pursuant to Order in Council P.C. 1965-2215 of December 13, 1965 (a) how many relocation requests were submitted by residents of each province (b) how many of these requests were approved (c) what amount was paid in each province?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/92.

No. 167—*Mr. Dinsdale*

1. How much money has been loaned to the provinces each year since 1969 for emergency winter works programmes?

2. What has been the allocation to each province for the above years?

3. What are the terms of repayment?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/167.

No. 204—*Mr. MacLean*

1. How many miles of road paid for in whole or in part by the federal government under an agreement with the Government of Prince Edward Island were paved in each of the fiscal years 1968-69, 1969-70 and 1970-71?

2. What percentage of the cost of the roads was borne by the federal government?

3. What was the cost to the federal government in each fiscal year?

4. Did the federal government require, as a condition, that certain standards for erosion control on the right-of-way be met and, if so, was it met by the Government of Prince Edward Island when these roads were paved?

5. Has any assessment been made by the Department of the Environment to determine the extent of the damage done by the erosion to the lands and streams adjoining these roads?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/204.

No. 266—*Mr. Rodrigue*

1. How many pension funds are administered by the government or agencies on behalf of government employees, agencies or Crown corporations?

2. What are the names of the pension funds?

3. How many persons are contributors?

4. What are the assets of each fund?

5. What was the amount of benefits paid during the 1970-71 fiscal year?

6. What was the percentage of increase of the assets in 1970-71 compared to the previous year?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/266.

No. 324—*Mr. McQuaid*

For the period February 1 to 15, were any contracts awarded for the supplying of file folders to any department and, if so (a) were tenders called prior to the awarding of such contracts and, if so (i) how many tenders were submitted (ii) what was the amount of each tender (iii) in what way were they advertised (b) to whom were the contracts awarded (c) how many file folders were involved?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/324.

No. 335—*Mr. Stewart* (Okanagan-Kootenay)

Under the Federal-Provincial Employment Loans Programme administered by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion (a) how many projects in British Columbia have received approval to date (b) what is the approximate cost of these projects (c) what specific projects in British Columbia have been approved (d) what is the total amount of the project loan in each instance?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/335.

Mr. Hogarth, Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. Pelletier,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Notices of Motions)

By unanimous consent, items numbered four and five were allowed to stand and retain their position.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mr. Winch, moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give immediate consideration to the advisability of amending the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Pension Plan to provide for the pensions payable under these two acts to be available at age 60 to all persons who meet the other requirements of the said acts and are prepared to withdraw from the labour market, and also to provide for the basic amount of the pension payable under the Old Age Security Act, at age 60 for those not in the labour market and at age 65 for all others, to be increased to \$150 per month, for this basic amount to be escalated each year by an amount that will enable pensioners to keep up with rising living costs and to share in rising living standards, and also for the elimination of any means or income test from the Old Age Security Act, so that the full pension thereunder will be recognized as the established right of all our people.—(Notice of Motion No. 6).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. Pelletier,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Mazankowski and Knight for Messrs. Horner and Burton on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Prud'homme, Guilbault, Osler and Chappell for Messrs. Breau, Rochon, Caccia and Portelance on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Messrs. Flemming, Danforth and Lambert (Edmonton West) for Messrs. Korchinski, Murta and Mackay on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Haidasz for Mr. Rock on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Knight for Mr. Burton on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. Broadbent and Weatherhead for Messrs. Orlikow and Lessard (LaSalle) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. McGrath and Hogarth for Messrs. Macquarrie and Lessard (LaSalle) on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Andras, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of expenditures incurred and proceedings taken under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 41(2) of the said Act, chapter F-5, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/145.

By Mr. Basford, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Capital Budget of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the year ending December 31, 1972, pursuant to section 70(2) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970, as approved by Order in Council P.C. 1972-607, dated March 28, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/109A.

By Mr. Jamieson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of Air Canada for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 27 of the Air Canada Act, chapter A-11, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/54.

By Mr. Jamieson,—Report to Parliament of the Auditors on the Accounts of Air Canada for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 28 of the Air Canada Act, chapter A-11, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/55.

By Mr. Jamieson,—Report on the Operations of the Shipping Conferences Exemption Act for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 12 of the said Act, chapter 39, R.S.C., 1970, 1st Supplement. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/367.

By Mr. Jamieson,—Report of work performed and expenditures made as of December 31, 1971, together with estimated expenditures for 1972, pursuant to section 8, chapter 3, Statutes of Canada, 1968-69, respecting the construction and completion of a line of railway by the Canadian National Railway Company from near mile 17 of the Windfall Extension to the Sangudo Subdivision to Bigstone, in the Province of Alberta. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/99C.

By Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Canadian Wheat Board for the Crop Year ended July 31, 1971, certified by the Auditors, pursuant to section 7(2) of the Canadian Wheat Board Act, chapter C-12, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/259.

By Mr. Marchand, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Cape Breton Development Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 33(1) of the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act, chapter C-13, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/106.

At 10.19 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 33

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Macdonald, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of a document describing the types of investigation being pursued by various government departments with respect to a northern pipeline. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/6.

Mr. Gray, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copy of Interpretation Bulletin, dated September 17, 1971, with reference to section

12(1)(b) and section 11(1)(a) of the Income Tax Act. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/5.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. Pelletier,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 10)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,
Alexander,
Alkenbrack,
Allmand,
Andras,
Badanai,
Baldwin,
Barnett,
Barrett,

Basford,
Beaudoin,
Bécharde,
Bell,
Benjamin,
Benson,
Blackburn,
Blair,
Blouin,

Borrie,
Boulanger,
Breau,
Brewin,
Broadbent,
Buchanan,
Burton,
Cafik,
Carter,

Chrétien,
Clermont,
Coates,
Cobbe,
Comtois,
Corbin,
Corriveau,
Côté (Richelieu),
Crossman,

Crouse,
Cullen,
Cyr,
Danforth,
Danson,
Davis,
Deachman,
Deakon,
De Bané,

Dinsdale,	Howe,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Otto,	Stafford,
Dionne,	Hymmen,	Mackasey,	Ouellet,	Stewart
Douglas,	Isabelle,	MacKay,	Paproski,	(Cochrane),
Drury,	Jerome,	MacLean,	Peddle,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Dubé,	Knight,	Macquarrie,	Pelletier,	Kootenay),
Dupras,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacRae,	Penner,	Sulatycky,
Duquet,	North Centre),	McBride,	Pepin,	Sullivan,
Fairweather,	Knowles (Norfolk-	McCleave,	Perrault,	Thomas
Faulkner,	Haldimand),	McCutcheon,	Peters,	(Maisonneuve-
Flemming,	Lachance,	McGrath,	Portelance,	Rosemont),
Forest,	Laflamme,	McIlraith,	Pringle,	Thomas
Forget,	Laing	McKinley,	Prud'homme,	(Moncton),
Fortin,	(Vancouver South),	McNulty,	Reid,	Thomson
Foster,	Lambert	Mahoney,	Richardson,	(Battleford-
Francis,	(Bellechasse),	Marceau,	Ritchie,	Kindersley),
Gauthier,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Marchand	Robinson,	Tolmie,
Gendron,	Humboldt),	(Langelier),	Rochon,	Trudeau,
Gervais,	Langlois,	Marshall,	Rock,	Trudel,
Gilbert,	Laniel,	Mather,	Rodrigue,	Turner
Gillespie,	Laprise,	Matte,	Rose,	(London East),
Gleave,	Latulippe,	Moore,	Roy (Laval),	Turner (Ottawa-
Goyer,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Munro,	Ryan,	Carleton),
Gray,	Lefebvre,	Murphy,	Saltsman,	Valade,
Grills,	Legault,	Murta,	Scott,	Walker,
Guay (St. Boniface),	Lessard	Nesbitt,	Serré,	Weatherhead,
Guay (Lévis),	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Noël,	Sharp,	Whelan,
Guilbault,	Lewis,	Nystrom,	Simpson,	Whicher,
Gundlock,	Lind,	O'Connell,	Skoberg,	Whiting,
Harding,	Loiselle,	Olson,	Skoreyko,	Winch,
Harkness,	Lundrigan,	Orange,	Smith	Yanakis,
Hogarth,	Macdonald	Orlikow,	(Saint-Jean),	Yewchuk—187.
Hopkins,	(Rosedale),	Osler,	Southam,	
Howard (Okanagan				
Boundary),				

NAYS

Messrs.

Godin,

Hellyer—2.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

[Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

By unanimous consent, orders numbered one, two, three and four were allowed to stand.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of Bill C-15, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (publication of the result of opinion polls);

Mr. Coates, seconded by Mr. MacRae, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And debate arising thereon;

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Cafik for Mr. Forget on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Whelan for Mr. Lajoie on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Weatherhead for Mr. Lessard (LaSalle) on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Howe for Mr. Downey on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

At 10.24 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 34

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-189, An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act (vessel bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Mather, seconded by Mr. Rynard, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-190, An Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (cigarette advertising), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Davis, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-191, An Act respecting wildlife in Canada, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure respecting wildlife in

Canada; to provide for agreements with the government of a province, municipal authorities, organizations or persons respecting wildlife research, conservation and interpretation programs and measures, and the payment of contributions in respect of costs and measures resulting therefrom; to provide for the purchase, acquisition or lease of lands; to provide for all costs incurred in the administration of the Act to be paid out of money appropriated by Parliament; and to provide for matters in connection with the administration of the Act.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following two Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 322—*Mr. Douglas*

1. How many oil exploration permits were issued by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources during 1971 covering areas of the coastal waters on the Pacific coast?

2. How many oil exploration permits on the Pacific coast were outstanding as of March 1, 1972?

3. What were the names and addresses of the companies granted these permits, on what dates were they issued and what is the area and the location covered by each permit?

4. What permits, if any, have been revoked since January 1, 1972?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/322.

No. 380—*Mr. MacRae*

What is the pay and allowances scale for all ranks of the Armed Forces?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/380.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 8, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study by Summerour and Associates Inc., Atlanta, Georgia, undertaken for the Department of Manpower and Immigration regarding the "Analysis of the Manpower Utilization of the Manitoba Garment Industry",

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 36, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of any report or reports prepared by or for the government recommending that Atomic Energy of Canada Limited assume responsibility for the reconstruction and operation of the Deuterium of Canada Limited heavy water production plant at Glace Bay, N.S.,

having been called was, at the request of the honourable Member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 38, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all telegrams or letters received by the Prime Minister or his office from February 21 to February 29, 1972, concerning the strike of outside workers at Montreal or the strike of federal electronic technicians,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of

children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Winch, moved in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-170 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation amending the Family Allowances Act and the Youth Allowances Act to provide for a substantial increase in the allowances paid thereunder, for continuing the principle of universality, and for related changes in the income tax legislation.

And debate arising thereon;

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Breau, Gendron, Walker and Deakon for Messrs. Allmand, Gibson, Isabelle and St. Pierre on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Return to an Order of the House, dated March 15, 1972, for a copy of the consultant report by Canadian Facts Company Limited, on a public opinion survey undertaken for the Department of Labour in the fiscal year 1968-69, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the 1st Session of this Parliament.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 32*).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/32.

By Mr. O'Connell, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on Proceedings under the Canada Labour Code Part V (Industrial Relations), for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 170 of the Canada Labour Code, chapter L-1, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/406.

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 35

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Anderson for Mr. Groos, seconded by Mr. Allmand, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-192, An Act respecting the certification of Masters of foreign vessels, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Anderson for Mr. Groos, seconded by Mr. Allmand, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-193, An Act respecting construction standards for foreign vessels, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Anderson for Mr. Groos, seconded by Mr. Allmand, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-194, An Act to control marine traffic on the west coast, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of

children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And on the motion of Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Winch, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-170 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation amending the Family Allowances Act and the Youth Allowances Act to provide for a substantial increase in the allowances paid thereunder, for continuing the principle of universality, and for related changes in the income tax legislation.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

[*Notices of Motions (Papers)*]

By unanimous consent, items numbered 2, 3 and 6 were allowed to stand.

Mr. Orlikow, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study by Summerour and Associates Inc., Atlanta, Georgia, undertaken for the Department of Manpower and Immigration regarding the "Analysis of the Manpower Utilization of the Manitoba Garment Industry".—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 8*).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And on the motion of Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Winch, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-170 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation amending the Family Allowances Act and the Youth Allowances Act to provide for a substantial increase in the allowances paid thereunder, for continuing the principle of universality, and for related changes in the income tax legislation.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.02 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Korchinski and Horner for Messrs. Nowlan and Southam on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Allmand, Gibson, Isabelle and St. Pierre for Messrs. Breau, Gendron, Walker and Deakon on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Crouse for Mr. MacKay on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Messrs. Major, Blair, Weatherhead, Deakon and Rock for Messrs. Caccia, Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo), Orange, McBride and Mazankowski on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Marceau for Mr. Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean) on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Messrs. Thomas (Maisonnette-Rosemont) and Duquet for Messrs. Harries and Rochon on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Orange for Mr. Badanai on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Deakon for Mr. Orange on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Macdonald, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of Eldorado Nuclear Limited and Eldorado Aviation Limited, including their Accounts and Financial Statements, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/129.

At 10.30 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 36

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

A petition was presented by the honourable Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand).

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-4, An Act to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways System and Air Canada for the period from the 1st day of January, 1971, to the 30th day of June, 1972, and to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railway Company and certain debentures to be issued by Air Canada, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

And on the motion of Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley), seconded by Mr. Harding, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-4 be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months hence.

And debate continuing;

[At 4.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

Order numbered one was allowed to stand at the request of the government.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs of Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act;

Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Cyr, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Anderson for Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo) on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

At 5.00 o'clock p.m. Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until Monday at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 37

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk of the House had laid upon the Table the Third Report of the Clerk of Petitions, which is as follows:

The Clerk of Petitions has the honour to report that he has examined the petition signed by Mr. Zafar Essak and other persons from various parts of Canada, in relation to Canada's participation in the United Nations and World Peace, presented by Mr. Warren Allmand, Member of Parliament, on Friday, April 21, 1972, and finds that the petition meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

Mr. Munro, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Convention on Social Security between Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany (with final protocol). Signed at Ottawa, March 30, 1971. In force May 1, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/88.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following Question was made an Order of the House for a Return:

No. 303—*Mr. Robinson*

1. How much has Canada provided to the World Food Programme in each year since its inception?

2. What other countries have contributed to the World Food Programme and in what amount since the programme was instituted?

3. What are the names of the countries now receiving food aid and how much in dollar value is each receiving?

4. What control, if any, does Canada have over the spending of funds in the World Food Programme?

5. Are contributions to the World Food Programme made in accordance with (a) Gross National Product (b) population and, if not, what criteria are used to determine the amount of the contribution?

6. What is the ratio of Canada's participation to that of the United States in the World Food Programme?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/303.

Mr. Cullen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, presented,—Return to the foregoing Order.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Stanfield, seconded by Mr. Hees, moved,—That because the Government has failed to produce measures to create employment, has failed to encourage investment in Canadian industry, and has caused widespread uncertainty as to its economic programmes, this House lacks confidence in the ability of the Government to meet the needs and challenges of the seventies.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved in amendment thereto,—That the motion be amended by inserting therein, immediately after the words "Canadian industry," the following words:

"has failed to introduce real reform of the tax system so as to redistribute income and reduce the tax burden on low and middle income groups,".

After debate thereon, at 9.45 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker interrupted the debate pursuant to Standing Order 58(9);

And the question being put on the said proposed amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 11)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Grills,	Lundrigan,	Marshall,	Ryan,
Alkenbrack,	Gundlock,	MacDonald	Mather,	Rynard,
Asselin,	Harding,	(Egmont),	Mazankowski,	Saltsman,
Baldwin,	Harkness,	MacInnis (Cape	Moore,	Schumacher,
Barnett,	Hees,	Breton-East	Muir,	Scott,
Bell,	Horner,	Richmond),	Murta,	Simpson,
Benjamin,	Howard (Skeena),	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Nesbitt,	Skoberg,
Blackburn,	Howe,	MacLean,	Noble,	Southam,
Carter,	Knight,	Macquarrie,	Nowlan,	Stanfield,
Crouse,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacRae,	Nystrom,	Stewart
Danforth,	North Centre),	McCleave,	Orlikow,	(Marquette),
Dinsdale,	Korchinski,	McCutcheon,	Paproski,	Thomson
Douglas,	Lambert	McGrath,	Peddle,	(Battleford-
Downey,	(Edmonton West),	McKinley,	Ritchie,	Kindersley),
Flemming,	Lewis,	McQuaid,	Rock,	Winch,
Gleave,			Rowland,	Yewchuk—70.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Dubé,	Isabelle,	Marchand	Smith
Badanai,	Dupras,	Lachance,	(Kamloops-	(Northumberland-
Barrett,	Duquet,	Laflamme,	Cariboo),	Miramichi),
Basford,	Éthier,	Laing	Morison,	Smith
Bécharde,	Faulkner,	(Vancouver South),	Munro,	(Saint-Jean),
Beer,	Forget,	Lajoie,	Murphy,	Stafford,
Benson,	Foster,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Noël,	Stanbury,
Blair,	Francis,	Humboldt),	O'Connell,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Borrie,	Gendron,	Langlois,	Olson,	Kootenay),
Boulanger,	Gervais,	Laniel,	Ouellet,	St. Pierre,
Caccia,	Gibson,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Pelletier,	Sulatycky,
Cafik,	Gillespie,	Lefebvre,	Penner,	Thomas
Chrétien,	Goyer,	Legault,	Pepin,	(Maisonneuve-
Clermont,	Gray,	Lessard	Perrault,	Rosemont),
Comtois,	Groos,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Portelance,	Trudeau,
Corriveau,	Guay	Loiselle,	Prud'homme,	Turner
Côté (Longueuil),	(St. Boniface),	MacEachen,	Reid,	(London East),
Crossman,	Guay (Lévis),	Mackasey,	Richardson,	Turner (Ottawa-
Cullen,	Guilbault,	McBride,	Roberts,	Carleton),
Cyr,	Haidasz,	McIlraith,	Robinson,	Wahn,
Davis,	Hogarth,	McNulty,	Rochon,	Walker,
Deachman,	Hopkins,	Mahoney,	Roy (Timmins),	Watson,
Deakon,	Howard (Okanagan	Major,	Roy (Laval),	Weatherhead,
De Bané,	Boundary),	Marchand	Sharp,	Whelan,
Drury,	Hymmen,	(Langelier),		Whicher,
				Yanakis—109.

And the question being put on the main motion, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 12)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Godin,	Latulippe,	Marshall,	Ryan,
Alkenbrack,	Grills,	Lewis,	Mather,	Rynard,
Asselin,	Gundlock,	Lundrigan,	Matte,	Saltsman,
Baldwin,	Harding,	MacDonald	Mazankowski,	Schumacher,
Barnett,	Harkness,	(Egmont),	Moore,	Scott,
Bell,	Hees,	MacInnis (Cape	Muir,	Simpson,
Benjamin,	Horner,	Breton-East	Murta,	Skoberg,
Blackburn,	Howard (Skeena),	Richmond),	Nesbitt,	Southam,
Carter,	Howe,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Noble,	Stanfield,
Crouse,	Knight,	MacLean,	Nowlan,	Stewart
Danforth,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Macquarrie,	Nystrom,	(Marquette),
Dinsdale,	North Centre),	MacRae,	Orlikow,	Tétrault,
Dionne,	Korchinski,	McCleave,	Paproski,	Thomson
Douglas,	Lambert	McCutcheon,	Peddle,	(Battleford-
Downey,	(Bellechasse),	McGrath,	Ritchie,	Kindersley),
Flemming,	Lambert	McKinley,	Rock,	Winch,
Fortin,	(Edmonton West),	McQuaid,	Rowland,	Yewchuk—78.
Gleave,	Laprise,			

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Dupras,	Laing	Munro,	Stanbury,
Badanai,	Duquet,	(Vancouver South),	Murphy,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Barrett,	Éthier,	Lajoie,	Noël,	Kootenay),
Basford,	Faulkner,	Lang (Saskatoon-	O'Connell,	St. Pierre,
Béchar, d,	Forget,	Humboldt),	Olson,	Sulatycky,
Beer,	Foster,	Langlois,	Ouellet,	Thomas
Benson,	Francis,	Laniel,	Pelletier,	(Maisonneuve-
Blair,	Gendron,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Penner,	Rosemont),
Borrie,	Gervais,	Lefebvre,	Pepin,	Trudeau,
Boulanger,	Gibson,	Legault,	Perrault,	Turner
Caccia,	Gillespie,	Lessard	Portelance,	(London East),
Cafik,	Goyer,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Prud'homme,	Turner (Ottawa-
Chrétien,	Gray,	Loiselle,	Reid,	Carleton),
Clermont,	Groos,	MacEachen,	Richardson,	Wahn,
Comtois,	Guay (St. Boniface),	Mackasey,	Roberts,	Walker,
Corriveau,	Guay (Lévis),	McBride,	Robinson,	Watson,
Côté (Longueuil),	Guilbault,	McIlraith,	Rochon,	Weatherhead,
Crossman,	Haidasz,	McNulty,	Roy (Timmins),	Whelan,
Cullen,	Hogarth,	Mahoney,	Roy (Laval),	Whicher,
Cyr,	Hopkins,	Major,	Sharp,	Yanakis—109.
Davis,	Howard (Okanagan	Marchand	Smith	
Deachman,	Boundary),	(Langelier),	(Northumberland-	
Deakon,	Hymmen,	Marchand	Miramichi),	
De Bané,	Isabelle,	(Kamloops-	Smith	
Drury,	Lachance,	Cariboo),	(Saint-Jean),	
Dubé,	Laflamme,	Morison,	Stafford,	

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo) for Mr. Weatherhead on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Caccia for Mr. Cyr on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo) and Ritchie for Messrs. Anderson and Code on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Peters for Mr. Burton on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. Dinsdale for Mr. Cadieu on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Jamieson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of Northern Transportation Company Limited, including its Accounts and Financial Statements, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/201.

By Mr. Richardson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Master of the Royal Canadian Mint, including its Accounts and Financial Statements, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/176.

At 10.15 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 38

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of a document entitled "Economic Review", April, 1972. (English and French). —Sessional Paper No. 284-1/315.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That a motion to be proposed concerning a ban on Atlantic salmon fishing be considered later this day, and that speeches thereon be limited to ten minutes for a representative from each party.

Pursuant to Order made this day, Mr. Fairweather, seconded by Mr. Davis, moved,—That,

Whereas the Atlantic salmon is the most threatened fish in the North Atlantic; and

Whereas only by a concerted international effort can an agreement be reached to protect salmon from being over-fished; and

Whereas it is the position of the Government of Canada that Canada has the exclusive right to harvest salmon that spawn in Canadian rivers,

That this Canadian House of Commons calls on all the nations participating in the International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Meeting in Washington, D.C. in May, 1972 to agree that the survival of the Atlantic salmon as a species is of paramount concern and to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure such survival.

After debate thereon, the said motion was agreed to.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And on the motion of Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Winch, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-170 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation amending the Family Allowances Act and the Youth Allowances Act to provide for a substantial increase in the allowances paid thereunder, for continuing the principle of univer-

sality, and for related changes in the income tax legislation.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to *Standing Order 15(4)*]

(Public Bills)

Orders numbered one and two were allowed to stand at the request of the government.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs of Bill C-13, An Act to amend the Combines Investigation Act (floor penalties, criminal joint tortfeasors, and moieties);

Mr. Orlikow, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for *Private Members' Business* expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And on the motion of Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Winch, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-170 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation amending the Family Allowances Act and the Youth Allowances Act to provide for a substantial increase in the allowances paid thereunder, for continuing the principle of universality, and for related changes in the income tax legislation.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to *Standing Order 40(1)*;

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to *Standing Order 65(4)(b)*, membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Southam and Stewart (Marquette) for Messrs. Danforth and Alkenbrack on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Nesbitt and Orange for Messrs. Nielsen and Blair on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Downey for Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Cyr, Loiselle and Yanakis for Messrs. Smith (Saint-Jean), LeBlanc (Rimouski) and Breau on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Fairweather for Mr. McCleave on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Mr. Kaplan for Mr. Pringle on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Weatherhead for Mr. Loiselle on the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Lajoie for Mr. Deakon on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to *Standing Order 41(1)*, namely:

By Mr. Andras, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copies of Order in Council P.C. 1972-723, dated April 18, 1972, amending Part II of the Schedule to the Hazardous Products Act, pursuant to section 8(3) of the said Act, chapter H-3, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/160A.

By Mr. Munro, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Report on the Administration of the Canada Pension Plan for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 118 of the said Act, chapter C-5, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/83.

At 10.21 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to *Standing Order 2(1)*.

No. 39

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Foster, from the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following votes listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50 and 55 relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues* Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4) is tabled.

(A copy of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence relating to the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 10 to the Journals).

Mr. Mackasey, seconded by Mr. Drury, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-195, An Act to amend the Adult Occupational Training Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to amend the Adult Occupational Training Act; to remove certain eligibility requirements to receive training allowances under the Act; to authorize contracts with a group or association of employers that operates or has arranged for the operation of an occupational training course for its adult employees; to provide that an employer may be paid for the cost of providing training on the job or in skills whether or not such training or skills are useful to that employer; and to provide for further and related amendments.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following two Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 253—Mr. Horner

How much money has the government spent in each of the past ten years on the ports of (a) Halifax (b) Quebec (c) Montreal (d) Toronto (e) Prince Rupert (f) Vancouver (g) Saint John (h) Churchill?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/253.

No. 448—*Mr. Nystrom*

1. Were any contracts awarded by the Department of Labour (including the Unemployment Insurance Commission) for publicity and/or information in the fiscal year 1970-71 and, if so (a) what were the names and addresses of firms which received such contracts (b) what was the amount of each such contract (c) what was the specific purpose of each such contract?

2. Do the main and supplementary estimates of the Department for the fiscal year 1971-72 provide an amount to be spent on publicity and/or information and, if so (a) what amount is provided (b) what amounts have been encumbered or spent to date (c) what are the names and addresses of the private firms which have entered into such contracts (d) what is the amount of money involved in such contract (e) what is the specific purpose of each such contract?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/448.

Mr. Hogarth, Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 24, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the feasibility study on marginal dairy farming undertaken for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in the fiscal year 1967-68, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the 1st Session of this Parliament excluding confidential references to individuals or individual firms,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 25, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence between the Minister of Transport and the CNR pertaining to recommendations of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications concerning the CNR Pension Plan,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 35, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the correspondence dated September 17, 1970, between the President of the CNR and the Minister of Transport outlining the company's position on the recommendation of

the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications concerning the CNR Pension Plan,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 41, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the final report of the Technical Committee created by the Minister of Agriculture to deal with the development of a national programme to help the small farms in Canada as well as any documents, letters or communications related to the Technical Committee,

having been called was, at the request of the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) for Mr. MacDonald (Egmont), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And on the motion of Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Winch, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-170 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation amending the Family Allowances Act and the Youth Allowances Act to provide for a substantial increase in the allowances paid thereunder, for continuing the principle of universality, and for related changes in the income tax legislation.

And debate continuing;

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Burton for Mr. Peters on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Annual Report of the Public Service Staff Relations Board for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 115 of the Public Service Staff Relations Act, chapter P-35, R.S.C., 1970. (English and

French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/219.

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 40

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of letter dated April 21, 1972, addressed by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of Canada to certain Premiers of the Provinces, with respect to manpower programs. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-5/53.

Mr. Aiken, from his place in the House, asked leave under Standing Order 26 to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, and stated the subject to be: the federal involvement in the James Bay hydro electric development project of the Province of Quebec and particularly (a) interference with and relocation of Indians (b) altering the course of navigable waters protected under the Navigable Waters Protection Act and (c) effect upon the total Canadian environment.

Accordingly, leave having been granted to debate the subject-matter;

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 9 of Standing Order 26, directed that the same stand over until 2.00 o'clock p.m., Friday, April 28, 1972.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And on the motion of Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Winch, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-170 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation amending the Family Allowances Act and the Youth Allowances Act to provide for a substantial increase in the allowances paid thereunder, for continuing the principle of universality, and for related changes in the income tax legislation.

After further debate, the question being put on the said proposed amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 13)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Dionne,	Lambert	McGrath,	Rose,
Alexander,	Douglas,	(Edmonton West),	McIntosh,	Rowland,
Alkenbrack,	Gauthier,	Latulippe,	McQuaid,	Rynard,
Baldwin,	Gilbert,	Lewis,	Marshall,	Saltsman,
Barnett,	Godin,	Lundrigan,	Mazankowski,	Scott,
Bell,	Grills,	MacDonald	Muir,	Simpson,
Benjamin,	Gundlock,	(Egmont),	Nesbitt,	Skoberg,
Blackburn,	Harding,	MacInnis (Cape	Nielsen,	Southam,
Brewin,	Horner,	Breton-East	Noble,	Tétrault,
Broadbent,	Knight,	Richmond),	Nystrom,	Thomas
Burton,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Paproski,	(Moncton),
Cadieu,	North Centre),	MacLean,	Peters,	Thomson
Carter,	Knowles (Norfolk-	MacRae,	Rock,	(Battleford-
Crouse,	Haldimand),	McCleave,	Rodrigue,	Kindersley),
Danforth,		McCutcheon,	Rondeau,	Valade,
				Winch—66.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Deachman,	Kaplan,	Marceau,	Roy (Laval),
Badanai,	De Bané,	Lachance,	Marchand	Serré,
Barrett,	Drury,	Lajoie,	(Kamloops-	Sharp,
Béchar, d,	Dubé,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Cariboo),	Smerchanski,
Benson,	Éthier,	Humboldt),	Morison,	Smith
Blouin,	Faulkner,	Langlois,	Munro,	(Saint-Jean),
Borrie,	Forest,	Laniel,	Noël,	Stafford,
Boulanger,	Forget,	La Salle,	Orange,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Buchanan,	Foster,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Osler,	Kootenay),
Caccia,	Francis,	Lefebvre,	Ouellet,	Trudel,
Cafik,	Gendron,	Legault,	Pelletier,	Turner
Chrétien,	Gillespie,	Lessard	Penner,	(London East),
Clermont,	Goode,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Pepin,	Turner (Ottawa-
Cobbe,	Guilbault,	L'Heureux,	Portelance,	Carleton),
Corriveau,	Haidasz,	Loiselle,	Prud'homme,	Wahn,
Côté (Richeliéu),	Harkness,	Macdonald	Reid,	Walker,
Côté (Longueuil),	Hellyer,	(Rosedale),	Richard,	Watson,
Cullen,	Hopkins,	MacEachen,	Richardson,	Weatherhead,
Cyr,	Hymmen,	McBride,	Roberts,	Whelan,
Danson,	Isabelle,	Mahoney,	Robinson,	Whicher,
			Roy (Timmins),	Whiting—93.

And the question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 14)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Badanai,	Bell,	Borrie,	Cadieu,
Alexander,	Baldwin,	Benson,	Boulanger,	Cafik,
Alkenbrack,	Barrett,	Blair,	Buchanan,	Carter,
Allmand,	Béchar, d,	Blouin,	Caccia,	Chrétien,

Clermont,	Guilbault,	Lundrigan,	Nesbitt,	Sharp,
Cobbe,	Gundlock,	MacDonald	Nielsen,	Simpson,
Corriveau,	Haidasz,	(Egmont),	Noël,	Smerchanski,
Côté (Richelieu),	Harkness,	Macdonald	Orange,	Smith
Côté (Longueuil),	Hopkins,	(Rosedale),	Osler,	(Saint-Jean),
Crouse,	Horner,	MacEachen,	Ouellet,	Southam,
Cullen,	Hymmen,	MacInnis (Cape	Paproski,	Stafford,
Cyr,	Isabelle,	Breton-East	Peddle,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Danforth,	Kaplan,	Richmond),	Pelletier,	Kootenay),
Danson,	Knowles (Norfolk-	MacLean,	Penner,	Tétrault,
Deachman,	Haldimand),	MacRae,	Pepin,	Thomas
De Bané,	Lachance,	McBride,	Portelance,	(Moncton),
Dionne,	Lajoie,	McCleave,	Prud'homme,	Trudel,
Drury,	Lang (Saskatoon-	McCutcheon,	Reid,	Turner
Dubé,	Humboldt),	McGrath,	Richard,	(London East),
Éthier,	Langlois,	McIntosh,	Richardson,	Turner (Ottawa-
Faulkner,	Laniel,	McQuaid,	Roberts,	Carleton),
Forest,	La Salle,	Mahoney,	Robinson,	Valade,
Forget,	Latulippe,	Marceau,	Rock,	Wahn,
Foster,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Marchand	Rodrigue,	Walker,
Francis,	Lefebvre,	(Kamloops-	Rondeau,	Watson,
Gauthier,	Legault,	Cariboo),	Roy (Timmins),	Weatherhead,
Gendron,	Lessard	Marshall,	Roy (Laval),	Whelan,
Gillespie,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Mazankowski,	Rynard,	Whicher,
Godin,	L'Heureux,	Muir,	Scott,	Whiting—135.
Goode,	Loiselle,	Munro,	Serré,	

NAYS

Messrs.

Barnett,	Burton,	Knight,	Nystrom,	Skoberg,
Benjamin,	Douglas,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Peters,	Thomson
Blackburn,	Gilbert,	North Centre),	Rose,	(Battleford-
Brewin,	Harding,	Lewis,	Rowland,	Kindersley),
Broadbent,	Hellyer,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Saltsman,	Winch—22.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed Bill C-78, An Act respecting the use of the expression "Parliament Hill", with the following amendments:

Page 1: Line 9: After the word "location" insert the words "in the National Capital Region".

Page 1: Strike out line 17 and substitute therefor the following:

"establishment providing services".

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs of Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act;

Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Benson, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

A Message was received from the Senate as follows:

Ordered,—That the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the Senate; and

That a message be sent to the House of Commons to acquaint that House accordingly.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Danforth, Alkenbrack and Downey for Messrs. Stewart (Marquette), Murta and Moore on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Anderson for Mr. Deakon on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Gilbert for Mr. Mather on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Messrs. Nielsen and Cadieu for Messrs. Nesbitt and Dinsdale on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Messrs. Roy (Timmins), Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean), Whicher, Stafford, Smith (Saint-Jean), Sullivan and La Salle for Messrs. Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont), Forest, Portelance, Jerome, Loiselle, Yanakis and McBride on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Messrs. Mazankowski, Horner, Broadbent and Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay) for Messrs. Schumacher, Muir, Nystrom and Reid on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. McCleave for Mr. Alexander on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Messrs. Clermont and Roy (Laval) for Messrs. Turner (London East) and Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)

on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Goyer, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copy of a Contract between the Government of Canada and the Municipality of Salmon Arm, British Columbia, pursuant to subsection 3 of section 20 of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, chapter R-9, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/268.

By Mr. Jamieson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copies of Financial Statement on the operation and maintenance, together with a statement showing the net capital investment, for the year ended December 31, 1971, under authority of chapter 56, Statutes of Canada, 1960-61, respecting the railway line constructed by the Canadian National Railway Company from a point near Grimshaw, in the Province of Alberta in a northerly direction to Great Slave Lake in the Northwest Territories, pursuant to section 9 of the said Act. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/99D.

At 10.22 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 41

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Macdonald, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Telex, addressed by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to Canadian Copper Exporters to Japan. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/4A.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

And debate continuing, pursuant to Special Order, the said debate was interrupted.

Pursuant to Standing Order 26, at 2.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Aiken, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, moved,—That this House do now adjourn.

After debate thereon, Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Loiselle for Mr. Caccia on the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

At 6.26 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until Monday at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 42

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, MAY 1, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Ordered,—That the House revert to "Motions" at 5.00 o'clock p.m., Tuesday, May 2, 1972, for the purpose of hearing a statement by the Minister of National Revenue.

Mr. MacEachen for Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-196, An Act to amend the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Hopkins, seconded by Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-197, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (Canadian and Provincial flags), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Hopkins, seconded by Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-198, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (foreign flags), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following three Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 256—*Mr. Laprise*

1. What projects have been approved in the constituency of Abitibi under the Local Initiatives Programme and what is the nature of each project?

2. Which projects in the constituency of Abitibi have been rejected and for what specific reason was each one rejected?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/256.

No. 315—*Mr. Robinson*

1. What research studies on the Arctic does the government support at the present time?

2. Do the research results thus far indicate the feasibility of a pipeline being constructed from the Arctic to the South?

3. To what extent is permafrost still a problem, does the research indicate that it can be overcome and, if so, by what means?

4. To what extent would a pipeline from the North irreparably damage the ecology, terrain and wildlife, according to the research?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/315.

No. 378—*Mr. Beaudoin*

1. Have federal Experimental Farm Stations called for tenders for chemical fertilizers since January 1970 and, if so, on how many occasions?

2. For each tender call (a) what are the names and addresses of the companies who submitted tenders (b) what was the amount of each tender (c) who received the contract and for what reasons?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/378.

Mr. Cullen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Notices of Motions)

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont), seconded by Mr. McKinley, moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider, in furtherance of the objectives of the United Nations, the establishment and operation in Canada of a world centre to program and administer co-operation between and co-ordination of the efforts of experts and institutions in their studies of compelling world issues respecting (a) international relations and peace (e.g. problems of peace-keeping, arms control and disarmament, human rights and intercultural communications) (b) global problems of development (e.g. the use of natural resources, international trade and problems of developing economies, transfers of science and technology, population problems and concerns of youth) (c) the environment and, in particular, the impact of science and technology on the environment.—(*Notice of Motion No. 4*).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Code Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Nystrom for Mr. Broadbent on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Pepin, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Quarterly Report of the Employment Support Board, for the annual quarter ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 21 of the Employment Support Act, chapter 56, Statutes of Canada, 1970-1971-1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/180A.

At 10.28 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 43

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Skoberg, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-199, An Act to amend the Railway Act (deviations, changes and removal), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs of Bill C-6, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act;

Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Mahoney, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

Pursuant to Special Order made Monday, May 1, 1972, at 5.00 o'clock p.m., the House reverted to "Motions".

Mr. Gray, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—(1) Copies of document entitled "Foreign Direct Investment in Canada". (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-4/49.

(2) Copies of a paper entitled "An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons". (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-4/49A.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Mahoney,—That Bill C-6, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Agriculture of Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act;

Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

And debate arising thereon;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay) and Cadieu for Messrs. Stewart (Cochrane) and Downey on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Mather for Mr. Gilbert on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Messrs. Badanai and Howe for Messrs. Kaplan and Forrestall on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Messrs. Gilbert and Broadbent for Mrs. MacInnis and Mr. Mather on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Skoreyko for Mr. Downey on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Ryan for Mr. Rynard on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

At 10.28 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 44

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Turner (London East) for Mr. Lessard (LaSalle), from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

In relation to its Order of Reference of February 28, 1972, your Committee recommends that it be granted permission to adjourn from place to place within South Western Ontario during the week of May 28, 1972 for the purpose of hearing representations on the adequacy of passenger service in the area and that the necessary supporting staff do accompany the Committee.

Mr. Chrétien, seconded by Mr. Drury, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-200, An Act to amend the National Parks Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following four Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 49—*Mr. Macquarrie*

1. Did the Department of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Department of the Secretary of State, or the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development participate in any way in the organization

or funding of the trip of the Sioux Valley Dancers of the Sioux Valley Reserve near Brandon to Yugoslavia last summer?

2. Were any representations made by this group to the Department of External Affairs as to the financial arrangements provided by the Yugoslavian Government and, if so, what action was taken by the Department of External Affairs?

3. Were any representations made by the Department of External Affairs to the Yugoslavian Government regarding the financial arrangements made by the Yugoslavian Government and, if so, what was the response of the Yugoslavian Government?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/49.

No. 228—*Mr. Stewart (Marquette)*

1. Since 1965, how many Canadian Forces Bases have been closed and where was each located?

2. In each case (a) how many Canadian Armed Forces personnel were transferred out of the area (b) what was the number of civilian personnel laid off for whom alternative satisfactory employment was not found (c) what is the present status of the land and buildings and how much money has been recovered by the federal government as a result of their disposal?

3. Does the government consider that the base consolidation and closing programme has caused economic and

other hardships to the areas concerned and, if so, for what reason?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/228.

No. 379—*Mr. Beaudoin*

1. Under the Local Initiatives Programme, what was the total amount granted to each province and how many jobs were to be created in each case?

2. Under this programme, what total amount was granted to each constituency in the Province of Quebec and how many jobs were to be created in each case?

3. What are the names of the organizations that presented projects under this programme in the constituency of Richmond?

4. What was the title of each project from the constituency of Richmond?

5. Were some projects rejected and, if so (a) which ones (b) how many jobs would have been created by each (c) what amount of money was requested in each case?

6. What was the total amount granted under the Local Initiatives Programme in the constituency of Richmond?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/379.

No. 452—*Mr. Nystrom*

1. Were any contracts awarded by the Department of Manpower and Immigration for publicity and/or information in the fiscal year 1970-71 and, if so (a) what were the names and addresses of firms which received such contracts (b) what was the amount of each such contract (c) what was the specific purpose of each such contract?

2. Do the main and supplementary estimates of the Department for the fiscal year 1971-72 provide an amount to be spent on publicity and/or information and, if so (a) what amount is provided (b) what amounts have been encumbered or spent to date (c) what are the names and addresses of the private firms which have entered into such contracts (d) what is the amount of money involved in each such contract (e) what is the specific purpose of each such contract?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/452.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Ordered,—That there be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence between Mr. John Lammers of Yukon Wilderness Limited and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and/or any officials in that Department.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 43—Mr. Orlikow*).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 45, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all letters received by the Postmaster General or any other

member of the government since January 1, 1971, complaining about postal service and the replies thereto, having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Korchinski, seconded by Mr. McKinley, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-5 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation to amend the Farm Credit Act by incorporating the incentive principle—already approved by this House in other legislation—to provide for partial non-repayment of interest where young farmers meet performance standards, for deferred interest payments on all loans during an initial period, for equitable adjustment of interest rates for the benefit of borrowers; and, as well, to provide for open-end loans which will allow additional borrowing without refinancing costs.

And debate arising thereon;

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Moore for Mr. Alkenbrack on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Roy (Laval) for Mr. McNulty on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Pepin, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Export Development Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1971, together with financial statements pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/289.

By Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission for the year ended December 31, 1971, including financial statements, pursuant to section 7 of the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission Act, chapter 19, Statutes of Canada, 1964-65.

(English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/229.

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 45

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Mackasey, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Report entitled "Status of Women in Canada—1972". (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-4/104.

Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. Gray, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons; to provide for the appointment of a Registrar; to provide for the designation of any person to carry out investigations under the Act; to provide for fees and allowances to persons summoned to attend investigations under the Act; and to provide for matters in connection with the administration of the Act.

Pursuant to Standing Order 60, an Order of the Day, for the consideration of a Ways and Means Motion, was designated for Monday, May 8, 1972, at 8.00 o'clock p.m., in order to permit a budget presentation by the Honourable the Minister of Finance.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture;

And on the motion of Mr. Korchinski, seconded by Mr. McKinley, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-5 be now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation to amend the Farm Credit Act by incorporating the incentive principle—already approved by this House in other legislation—to provide for partial non-repayment of interest where young farmers meet performance standards, for deferred interest payments on all loans during an initial period, for equitable adjustment of interest rates for the benefit of borrowers; and, as well, to provide for open-end loans which will allow additional borrowing without refinancing costs.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley), proposed to move in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the amendment be amended by deleting therefrom the words “where young farmers meet performance standards,” and by substituting therefor the words “for young farmers.”

And debate arising thereon;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

[*Notices of Motions (Papers)*]

By unanimous consent, items numbered 2, 3, 6, 36 and 38 were allowed to stand.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Orlikow, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study by Summerour and Associates Inc., Atlanta, Georgia, undertaken for the Department of Manpower and Immigration regarding the “Analysis of the Manpower Utilization of the Manitoba Garment Industry”.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 8*).

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived, on division.

By unanimous consent, items numbered 24, 25, 35 and 41 were allowed to stand.

Mr. Dinsdale, seconded by Mr. Bell, moved,—That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all letters received by the Postmaster General or any other member of the government since January 1, 1971, complaining about postal service and the replies thereto.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 45*).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for *Private Members' Business* expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture;

And on the motion of Mr. Korchinski, seconded by Mr. McKinley, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-5 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation to amend the Farm Credit Act by incorporating the incentive principle—already approved by this House in other legislation—to provide for partial non-repayment of interest where young farmers meet performance standards, for deferred interest payments on all loans during an initial period, for equitable adjustment of interest rates for the benefit of borrowers; and, as well, to provide for open-end loans which will allow additional borrowing without refinancing costs.

And on the motion of Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley), in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the amendment be amended by deleting therefrom the words “where young farmers meet performance standards,” and by substituting therefor the words “for young farmers.”

And debate continuing;

(*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question “That this House do now adjourn” was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Stewart (Marquette) and LeBlanc (Rimouski) for Messrs. Danforth and McBride on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. McCleave for Mr. Fairweather on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Messrs. Deakon and Crossman for Messrs. Anderson and Blouin on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

At 10.16 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 46

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

On motion of Mr. Turner (London East) for Mr. Lesard (LaSalle), seconded by Mr. Portelance, the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, presented to the House on Wednesday, May 3, 1972, was concurred in.

The following Notice of Motion having been called was transferred to Government Orders for consideration at the next sitting of the House pursuant to Standing Order 21(2):

That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty the Queen in the following words:

To the Queen's most Excellent Majesty:

Most Gracious Sovereign:

We Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty praying that You may graciously be pleased to cause a measure to be laid before the Parliament of the United Kingdom to be expressed as follows:

An Act to amend the British North
America Act, 1949

Whereas Canada has requested, and consented to, the enactment of the following provisions, and the Senate and

House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled have submitted an Address to Her Majesty praying that Her Majesty may graciously be pleased to cause a measure to be laid before the Parliament of the United Kingdom for that purpose:

Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

*Terms of
Union of
Newfound-
land with
Canada
amended*

1. Term 17 of the *Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada* set out in the Schedule to the *British North America Act, 1949* is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"17. (1) In lieu of section ninety-three of the *British North America Act, 1867*, the following Term shall apply in respect of the Province of Newfoundland:

In and for the Province of Newfoundland the Legislature shall have exclusive authority to make laws in relation to education, but the Legislature will not have authority to make laws prejudicially affecting any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, common (amal-

gamated) schools, or denominational colleges, that any class or classes of persons had by law in Newfoundland at the date of Union, or any like right or privilege with respect to such schools or colleges that any other class or classes of persons have had by law in Newfoundland after the date of Union as members of a religious denomination or one of a group of religious denominations that, by or under the Schools Act of Newfoundland, is or at any time has been recognized as being organized for educational purposes, and out of public funds of the Province of Newfoundland provided for education,

(a) all such schools shall receive their share of such funds in accordance with scales determined on a non-discriminatory basis from time to time by the Legislature for all schools then being conducted under authority of the Legislature and

(b) all such colleges shall receive their share of any grant from time to time voted for all colleges then being conducted under authority of the Legislature, such grant being distributed on a non-discriminatory basis.

(2) In this Term, "Schools Act of Newfoundland" means The Schools Act, 1969, being the Act No. 68 of 1969 (Statutes of Newfoundland), as amended from time to time, or any Act substituted therefor as amended from time to time."

Coming into
force of
amendment

2. For greater certainty, the provisions of Term 50 of the *Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada* set out in the Schedule to the *British North America Act, 1949*, in so far as those provisions relate to the approval and coming into force of the said Terms, do not apply to or in respect of the amendment set out in section 1 of this Act.

Short title
and citation

3. This Act may be cited as the *British North America Act, 1972*; and the *British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965*, and this Act may be cited together as the *British North America Acts, 1867 to 1972*.—*The Minister of Transport.*

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration of Bill C-195, An Act to amend the Adult Occupational Training Act;

Mr. Mackasey, seconded by Mr. Drury, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

[Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

The Order being read for the consideration of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-78, An Act respecting the use of the expression "Parliament Hill";

By unanimous consent, Mr. Blair, seconded by Mr. Francis, moved,—That the said amendments be now read a second time and concurred in.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Accordingly, the said amendments were read the second time and concurred in.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. McCleave for Mr. Fairweather on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

By unanimous consent, at 4.55 o'clock p.m. the House adjourned until Monday at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 47

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, MAY 8, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont), seconded by Mr. Bell, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-202, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (prisoners enfranchised), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Pelletier, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-203, An Act to amend the Representation Commissioner Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to amend the Representation Commissioner Act to provide for an increase in the salary of the Representation Commissioner.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Sharp, it was ordered,—That the Stand-

ing Committee on Veterans Affairs be authorized to hear evidence from spokesmen for:

1. The Hong Kong Veterans Association of Canada,
2. The National Prisoners of War Association, and
3. The Dieppe Veterans and Prisoners of War Association,

concerning disability pensions of members of the armed forces who were prisoners of war.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following Question was made an Order of the House for a Return:

No. 149—*Mr. Orlikow*

1. How many federal correctional institutions are there in Canada?
2. What are the names of the Wardens of each of these institutions, and how long have they been in their positions?
3. What, if any, are their professional qualifications?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/149.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Return to the foregoing Order.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture;

And on the motion of Mr. Korchinski, seconded by Mr. McKinley, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-5 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation to amend the Farm Credit Act by incorporating the incentive principle—already approved by this House in other legislation—to provide for partial non-repayment of interest where young farmers meet performance standards, for deferred interest payments on all loans during an initial period, for equitable adjustment of interest rates for the benefit of borrowers; and, as well, to provide for open-end loans which will allow additional borrowing without refinancing costs.

And on the motion of Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley), in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the amendment be amended by deleting therefrom the words “where young farmers meet performance standards,” and by substituting therefor the words “for young farmers,”.

After further debate, on motion of Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), the said debate was adjourned.

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Notices of Motions)

By unanimous consent, item numbered five was allowed to stand and retain its position.

Mr. Mather, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give immediate consideration to initiating an Opportunities for Age program designed to improve the health, economic, occupational, recreational, social and cultural opportunities of the senior citizens of Canada, and that in the organization and administration of such a program the senior citizens' associations be consulted and involved.—(Notice of Motion No. 7).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

At 8.00 o'clock p.m., the Order being read for the consideration of a Ways and Means Motion;

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Benson, moved,—That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

And debate arising thereon;

Ordered,—That a Budget Paper entitled “Review of Government Accounts 1971-72” be printed as an Appendix to this day's *Hansard*.

Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—(1) Notice of Ways and Means Motion to amend the Income Tax Act. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/309.

(2) Notice of Ways and Means Motion to amend the Income Tax Application Rules, 1971. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/310.

(3) Notice of Ways and Means Motion to amend the Excise Tax Act. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/311.

(4) Notice of Ways and Means Motion to amend Part IV of Chapter 63 of the Statutes of 1970-71-72. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/312.

(5) Notice of Ways and Means Motion to amend the Customs Tariff. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/313.

And debate continuing, the said debate was, on motion of Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. Nesbitt, adjourned.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Schumacher and Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand) for Messrs. Lundrigan and Thomas (Moncton) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Danforth and Murta for Messrs. Cadieu and Stewart (Marquette) on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. McNulty for Mr. Roy (Laval) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

By unanimous consent, at 9.55 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 48

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

On motion of Mr. MacEachen for Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Benson, it was ordered,—That a bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act" when introduced and read the first time will be ordered to be printed and to stand for consideration by the House at the report stage at the next sitting of the House.

On motion of Mr. MacEachen for Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Benson, Bill C-204, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act was read the first time, ordered to be printed and in accordance with Special Order made this day, stood for consideration at the report stage at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act; to provide that the sum certain to be paid for wheat is to be determined in respect of a base grade as prescribed by regulation; to provide that the amount payable to a producer in respect of wheat may be fixed so as to reflect quality within a grade; to extend the

application of the Act to flaxseed, rye and rapeseed; and to provide for related and consequential matters.

Mr. Rynard, seconded by Mr. McIntosh, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-205, An Act to amend the Criminal Records Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture;

And on the motion of Mr. Korchinski, seconded by Mr. McKinley, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-5 be now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation to amend the Farm Credit Act by incorporating the incentive principle—already approved by this House in other legislation—to provide for partial non-repayment

of interest where young farmers meet performance standards, for deferred interest payments on all loans during an initial period, for equitable adjustment of interest rates for the benefit of borrowers; and, as well, to provide for open-end loans which will allow additional borrowing without refinancing costs.

And on the motion of Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley), in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the amendment be amended by deleting therefrom the words “where young farmers meet performance standards,” and by substituting therefor the words “for young farmers,”.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

By unanimous consent, orders numbered one, two and three were allowed to stand.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications of Bill C-17, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Act (seat belts);

Mr. Mather, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture;

And on the motion of Mr. Korchinski, seconded by Mr. McKinley, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-5 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation to amend the Farm Credit Act by incorporating the incentive principle—already approved by this House in other legislation—to provide for partial non-repayment of interest where young farmers meet performance

standards, for deferred interest payments on all loans during an initial period, for equitable adjustment of interest rates for the benefit of borrowers; and, as well, to provide for open-end loans which will allow additional borrowing without refinancing costs.

And on the motion of Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley), in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the amendment be amended by deleting therefrom the words “where young farmers meet performance standards,” and by substituting therefor the words “for young farmers,”.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question “That this House do now adjourn” was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Guay (Lévis) and Osler for Messrs. Sullivan and Hogarth on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Messrs. Cadieu and Downey for Messrs. Moore and Southam on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MacKay for Mr. McCleave on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Morison for Mr. Murphy on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton) for Mr. Alexander on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Hales for Mr. McCleave on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Noble for Mr. McCleave on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

At 10.29 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 49

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Gervais, from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following votes listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Vote 1 relating to the Department of the Solicitor General;

Votes 5, 10 and 15 relating to Correctional Services;

Votes 20 and 25 relating to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 3, 4 and 5*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 11 to the Journals).

Mr. Portelance, from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following votes listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Votes 1, 5 and 10 relating to the Department of Manpower and Immigration;

Vote 25 relating to the Immigration Appeal Board.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 8*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 12 to the Journals).

Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Text of Note presented to the Government of the French Republic on Pacific Nuclear Tests. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/107A.

Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-206, An Act to amend

the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Employment Act with respect to discrimination in employment based on age, sex and marital status, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading later this day.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to amend the Old Age Security Act; to fix the basic amount of the old age pension at eighty dollars per month and to provide that it will be escalated annually to reflect the full amount of any increase in the Consumer Price Index with the initial escalation to be effective from January 1, 1972 with no decrease where in a year there is a reduction in the Index; to reduce the residence requirements of pensioners residing outside Canada; to provide for an increase in the maximum amount of any guaranteed income supplement that may be paid to a pensioner for any month in the fifteen month period commencing January 1, 1972 and that any such supplement paid for any month after March, 1973 will be escalated annually to reflect the full amount of any increase in the Consumer Price Index with no decrease where in a year there is a reduction in the Index; to provide that the basis of calculation of the benefits that may be paid may be adjusted to reflect changes in the basis of the Consumer Price Index; and to provide for the payment to a person of any supplement that would not otherwise be payable to him for the first three months of the calendar year 1972 to be equal to the amount of any such payment that may be made to him for the month of April, 1972.

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 1, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all leases, assignments of leases, leasebacks, subleases, assignments of subleases, lending agreements, assignments of agreements, mortgages and contracts pertaining to the leasing and development of Main Square in the City of Toronto from the commencement of negotiations by developers with the CNR to the present time, that may be in the possession of or subject to the control of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation,

having been called was, at the request of the honourable Member for Spadina (Mr. Ryan), transferred by the

Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 14, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence, memoranda, etc., between the Government of Canada and the United Church of Canada and other individuals and organizations relating to the question of the sale of Ryerson Press Ltd.,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 16, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence and other documents between the government and firms or interested parties concerning adverse effects of the change to a floating dollar announced by the Minister of Finance in June, 1970,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture;

And on the motion of Mr. Korchinski, seconded by Mr. McKinley, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-5 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should give consideration to the introduction of legislation to amend the Farm Credit Act by incorporating the incentive principle—already approved by this House in other legislation—to provide for partial non-repayment of interest where young farmers meet performance standards, for deferred interest payments on all loans during an initial period, for equitable adjustment of interest rates for the benefit of borrowers; and, as well, to provide for open-end loans which will allow additional borrowing without refinancing costs.

And on the motion of Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Thomson (Battleground-Kindersley), in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the amendment be amended by deleting therefrom the words "where young farmers meet performance standards," and by substituting therefor the words "for young farmers,".

After further debate, the question being put on the said proposed amendment to the amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 15)

YEAS

Messrs.

Benjamin,
Brewin,
Broadbent,
Burton,
Douglas,
Gilbert,

Gleave,
Harding,
Knight,
Knowles (Winnipeg
North Centre),
Lewis,

MacInnis (Mrs.),
Mather,
Nystrom,
Orlikow,
Peters,

Rose,
Rowland,
Saltsman,
Skoberg,

Thomson
(Battleford-
Kindersley)—21.

NAYS

Messrs.

Aiken,
Alexander,
Alkenbrack,
Allmand,
Andras,
Asselin,
Badanai,
Barrett,
Basford,
Beaudoin,
Béchar,
Beer,
Bell,
Benson,
Bigg,
Blair,
Blouin,
Breau,
Buchanan,
Caccia,
Cadieu,
Cafik,
Caouette,
Carter,
Chrétien,
Clermont,
Cobbe,
Comtois,
Corbin,
Corriveau,
Côté (Richelieu),
Côté (Longueuil),
Crossman,
Crouse,
Cullen,
Cyr,
Danforth,
Danson,
Davis,

Deachman,
Deakon,
De Bané,
Diefenbaker,
Dinsdale,
Dionne,
Downey,
Drury,
Dubé,
Dupras,
Duquet,
Fairweather,
Faulkner,
Flemming,
Forest,
Forget,
Foster,
Francis,
Gauthier,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gibson,
Gillespie,
Godin,
Goode,
Goyer,
Gray,
Grills,
Guay (St. Boniface),
Guilbault,
Hees,
Hopkins,
Horner,
Howard (Okanagan
Boundary),
Howe,
Isabelle,
Jamieson,
Jerome,

Knowles (Norfolk-
Haldimand),
Korchinski,
Laing
(Vancouver South),
Lajoie
Lambert
(Edmonton West),
Lang (Saskatoon-
Humboldt),
Langlois,
Laniel,
Laprise,
La Salle,
Latulippe,
Leblanc (Laurier),
LeBlanc (Rimouski),
Legault,
Lessard
(Lac-Saint-Jean),
L'Heureux,
Lind,
MacDonald
(Egmont),
Macdonald
(Rosedale),
MacEachen,
MacInnis (Cape
Breton-East
Richmond),
MacKay,
Macquarrie,
MacRae,
McBride,
McCutcheon,
McGrath,
McIntosh,
McKinley,
McNulty,

McQuaid,
Mahoney,
Major,
Marceau,
Marchand
(Langelier),
Marchand
(Kamloops-
Cariboo),
Marshall,
Matte,
Mazankowski,
Muir,
Munro,
Murta,
Nesbitt,
Noble,
O'Connell,
Osler,
Otto,
Ouellet,
Paproski,
Peddle,
Pelletier,
Pepin,
Perrault,
Portelance,
Prud'homme,
Ricard,
Richardson,
Ritchie,
Roberts,
Rochon,
Rodrigue,
Roy (Timmins),
Roy (Laval),
Ryan,
Rynard,

Schumacher,
Serré,
Sharp,
Simpson,
Skoreyko,
Smith
(Northumberland-
Miramichi),
Smith
(Saint-Jean),
Southam,
Stafford,
Stanbury,
Stanfield,
Stewart
(Cochrane),
Stewart
(Marquette),
Stewart (Okanagan-
Kootenay),
Sullivan,
Tétrault,
Thomas
(Moncton),
Thompson
(Red Deer),
Tolmie,
Trudeau,
Trudel,
Turner
(London East),
Wahn,
Watson,
Weatherhead,
Whelan,
Whicher,
Whiting,
Yanakis—171.

And the question being put on the said proposed amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 16)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Downey,	La Salle,	McQuaid,	Rynard,
Alexander,	Fairweather,	Latulippe,	Marshall,	Schumacher,
Alkenbrack,	Flemming,	MacDonald	Matte,	Simpson,
Asselin,	Gauthier,	(Egmont),	Mazankowski,	Skoreyko,
Beaudoin,	Godin,	MacInnis (Cape	Muir,	Southam,
Bell,	Grills,	Breton-East	Murta,	Stanfield,
Bigg,	Hees,	Richmond),	Nesbitt,	Stewart
Cadieu,	Horner,	MacKay,	Noble,	(Marquette),
Caouette,	Howe,	Macquarrie,	Paproski,	Tétrault,
Carter,	Knowles (Norfolk-	MacRae,	Peddle,	Thomas
Crouse,	Haldimand),	McCutcheon,	Ricard,	(Moncton),
Danforth,	Korchinski,	McGrath,	Ritchie,	Thompson
Diefenbaker,	Lambert	McIntosh,	Rodrigue,	(Red Deer)—63.
Dinsdale,	(Edmonton West),	McKinley,	Ryan,	
Dionne,	Laprise,			

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Danson,	Isabelle,	Marceau,	Sharp,
Andras,	Davis,	Jamieson,	Marchand	Skoberg,
Badanai,	Deachman,	Jerome,	(Langelier),	Smith
Barrett,	Deakon,	Knight,	Marchand	(Northumberland-
Basford,	De Bané,	Knowles (Winnipeg	(Kamloops-	Miramichi),
Béchar,	Douglas,	North Centre),	Cariboo),	Smith
Beer,	Drury,	Laing	Mather,	(Saint-Jean),
Benjamin,	Dubé,	(Vancouver South),	Munro,	Stafford,
Benson,	Dupras,	Lajoie,	Nystrom,	Stanbury,
Blair,	Duquet,	Lang (Saskatoon	O'Connell,	Stewart
Blouin,	Faulkner,	Humboldt),	Orlikow,	(Cochrane),
Breau,	Forest,	Langlois,	Osler,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Brewin,	Forget,	Laniel,	Otto,	Kootenay),
Broadbent,	Foster,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Ouellet,	Sullivan,
Buchanan,	Francis,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Pelletier,	Thomson
Burton,	Gendron,	Legault,	Pepin,	(Battleford-
Caccia,	Gervais,	Lessard	Perrault,	Kindersley),
Cafik,	Gibson,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Peters,	Tolmie,
Chrétien,	Gilbert,	Lewis,	Portelance,	Trudeau,
Clermont,	Gillespie,	L'Heureux,	Prud'homme,	Trudel,
Cobbe,	Gleave,	Lind,	Richardson,	Turner
Comtois,	Goode,	Macdonald	Roberts,	(London East),
Corbin,	Goyer,	(Rosedale),	Rochon,	Wahn,
Corriveau,	Gray,	MacEachen,	Rose,	Watson,
Côté (Richelieu),	Guay (St. Boniface),	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Rowland,	Weatherhead,
Côté (Longueuil),	Guilbault,	McBride,	Roy (Timmins),	Whelan,
Crossman,	Harding,	McNulty,	Roy (Laval),	Whicher,
Cullen,	Hopkins,	Mahoney,	Saltsman,	Whiting,
Cyr,	Howard (Okanagan	Major,	Serré,	Yanakakis—129.
	Boundary),			

And the question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 17)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Deakon,	Knowles (Winnipeg	McQuaid,	Rynard,
Alexander,	De Bané,	North Centre),	Mahoney,	Saltsman,
Alkenbrack,	Diefenbaker,	Knowles (Norfolk-	Major,	Schumacher,
Allmand,	Dinsdale,	Haldimand),	Marceau,	Serré,
Andras,	Dionne,	Korchinski,	Marchand	Sharp,
Asselin,	Douglas,	Laing	(Langelier),	Simpson,
Badanai,	Downey,	(Vancouver South),	Marchand	Skoberg,
Barrett,	Drury,	Lajoie,	(Kamloops-	Skoreyko,
Basford,	Dubé,	Lambert	Cariboo),	Smith
Beaudoin,	Dupras,	(Edmonton West),	Marshall,	(Northumberland-
Béchar, d,	Duquet,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Mather,	Miramichi),
Beer,	Fairweather,	Humboldt),	Matte,	Smith
Bell,	Faulkner,	Langlois,	Mazankowski,	(Saint-Jean),
Benjamin,	Flemming,	Laniel,	Muir,	Southam,
Benson,	Forest,	Laprise,	Munro,	Stafford,
Bigg,	Forget,	La Salle,	Murta,	Stanbury,
Blair,	Foster,	Latulippe,	Nesbitt,	Stanfield,
Blouin,	Francis,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Noble,	Stewart
Breau,	Gauthier,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Nystrom,	(Cochrane),
Brewin,	Gendron,	Legault,	O'Connell,	Stewart
Broadbent,	Gervais,	Lessard	Orlikow,	(Marquette),
Buchanan,	Gibson,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Osler,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Burton,	Gilbert,	Lewis,	Otto,	Kootenay),
Caccia,	Gillespie,	L'Heureux,	Ouellet,	Sullivan,
Cafik,	Gleave,	Lind,	Paproski,	Tétrault,
Caouette,	Godin,	MacDonald	Peddle,	Thomas
Carter,	Goode,	(Egmont),	Pelletier,	(Moncton),
Chrétien,	Goyer,	Macdonald	Pepin,	Thompson
Clermont,	Gray,	(Rosedale),	Perrault,	(Red Deer),
Cobbe,	Grills,	MacEachen,	Peters,	Thomson
Comtois,	Guay (St. Boniface),	MacInnis (Cape	Portelance,	(Battleford-
Corbin,	Guilbault,	Breton-East	Prud'homme,	Kindersley),
Corriveau,	Harding,	Richmond),	Ricard,	Tolmie,
Côté (Richelieu),	Hees,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Richardson,	Trudeau,
Côté (Longueuil),	Hopkins,	MacKay,	Ritchie,	Trudel,
Crossman,	Horner,	Macquarrie,	Roberts,	Turner
Crouse,	Howard (Okanagan	MacRae,	Rochon,	(London East),
Cullen,	Boundary),	McBride,	Rodrigue,	Wahn,
Cyr,	Howe,	McCutcheon,	Rose,	Watson,
Danforth,	Isabelle,	McGrath,	Rowland,	Weatherhead,
Danson,	Jamieson,	McIntosh,	Roy (Timmins),	Whelan,
Davis,	Jerome,	McKinley,	Roy (Laval),	Whicher,
Deachman,	Knight,	McNulty,	Ryan,	Whiting,
				Yanakis—191.

NAYS

Messrs.

NIL

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

and Social Affairs of Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act;

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare

Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Marshall, seconded by Mr. Crouse, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That all the words after "That" be struck out and there be substituted the following:

"this House, deeply conscious of the need to increase the Old Age Security pension so as to reflect the full increase in the Consumer Price Index since January 1, 1967 to date, with adjustments to the Guaranteed Income Supplement, is of the opinion that the Government should consider the advisability of introducing appropriate amendments to effect such changes to the present limited terms of the Bill."

And debate arising thereon;

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mrs. MacInnis for Mr. Broadbent on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Alexander for Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Halifax) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Broadbent for Mr. Nystrom on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Messrs. Sullivan and MacKay for Messrs. Guay (Lévis) and Alexander on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. De Bané for Mr. Béchard on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. Foster for Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski) on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Goyer, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copy of Contracts entered into between the Government of Canada and the Municipality of the New Town of Fox Creek, in the Province of Alberta, pursuant to subsection 3 of section 20 of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, chapter R-9, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/266.

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 50

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Gervais, from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, presented the Third Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Tuesday, May 2, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, and has agreed to report it with the following amendments:

Clause 4

Strike out lines 4 to 13 inclusive on page 5 and substitute the following therefor:

"4. Subsection 9(1) of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"9. (1) Where a court, judge, justice or magistrate summarily convicts a person for a contempt of court committed in the face of the court and imposes punishment in respect thereof, that person may appeal

(a) from the conviction, or

(b) against the punishment imposed."

Clause 6

Strike out lines 1 to 5 inclusive on page 6 and substitute the following therefor:

"76. (1) Every one who, unlawfully, by force or threat thereof, or by any other form of intimidation, seizes or exercises control of an aircraft with intent"

Clause 8

Strike out lines 18 to 32 inclusive on page 8 and substitute the following therefor:

"127. (1) Every one who wilfully attempts in any manner to obstruct, pervert or defeat the course of justice in a judicial proceeding,

(a) by indemnifying or agreeing to indemnify a surety, in any way and either in whole or in part, or

(b) where he is a surety, by accepting or agreeing to accept a fee or any form of indemnity whether in whole or in part from or in respect of a person who is released or is to be released from custody,

is guilty of

(c) an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for two years, or

(d) an offence punishable on summary conviction."

Clause 18

Add, immediately after line 17 on page 13, the following new subclause:

"(1.1) Section 238 of the said Act is further amended by adding thereto, immediately after subsection (3) thereof, the following subsection:

Exception

'(3.1) Subsection (3) does not apply to a person who drives a motor vehicle in Canada while he is disqualified or prohibited from driving a motor vehicle by reason of the legal suspension or cancellation, in any province, of his permit or licence or of his right to secure a permit or licence to drive a motor vehicle in that province, where that suspension or cancellation is inconsistent with an order made with respect to him under subsection (1).'

Clause 25

Strike out lines 1 to 14 on page 18 and substitute the following therefor:

"25. Subsection 309 (1) of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

'309. (1) Every one who, without lawful excuse, the proof of which lies upon him, has in his possession any instrument suitable for house-breaking, vault-breaking or safe-breaking, under circumstances that give rise to a reasonable inference that the instrument has been used or is or was intended to be used for house-breaking, vault-breaking or safe-breaking is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for fourteen years'."

Clause 26

Strike out lines 15 to 28 inclusive on page 18 and substitute the following therefor:

"26. Section 310 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

'310. Every one who, without lawful excuse, the proof of which lies upon him, has in his possession any instrument suitable for breaking into a coin-operated device, under circumstances that give rise to a reasonable inference that the instrument has been used or is or was intended to be used for breaking into a coin-operated device, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for two years'."

Clause 38

Strike out line 30 on page 24 and substitute the following therefor:

"practitioner where"

Strike out line 32 on page 24 and substitute the following therefor:

"doing and where a medical practi-"

Clause 43

Strike out line 22 on page 26 and substitute the following therefor:

"43. (1) Section 508 of the said Act is"

Add immediately after line 37 on page 26 the following new subclause:

"(2) Subsection 508(2) of the said Act, as enacted by subsection (1), applies to proceedings stayed in accordance with subsection (1) of that section either before or after the coming into force of this Act."

Clause 44

Strike out line 12 on page 27 and substitute the following therefor:

"titioner where com-"

Strike out line 14 on page 27 and substitute the following therefor:

"and where a medical practitioner"

Clause 54

Strike out line 24 on page 31 and substitute the following therefor:

"titioner where com-"

Strike out line 26 on page 31 and substitute the following therefor:

"and where a medical practitioner is"

Clause 63

Strike out line 1 on page 37 and substitute the following therefor:

"practitioner where"

Strike out line 3 on page 37 and substitute the following therefor:

"doing and where a medical prac-"

New Clause 73.A

Add, immediately after line 22 on page 42 the following new clause:

"73.A Paragraph 134(b) of the said Act is repealed."

Your Committee has ordered a reprint of Bill C-2, as amended, for the use of the House of Commons, at the Report Stage, pursuant to Standing Order 75(2).

A copy of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence relating to this Bill (*Issues Nos. 5, 6 and 7*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 13 to the Journals).

Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-208, An Act to amend the Pension Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act, the Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act and the Department of Veterans Affairs Act to provide for the annual adjustment of pensions and allowances payable thereunder, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to amend the Pension Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act and the Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act to provide that pensions and allowances payable thereunder will be escalated annually to reflect the full amount of any increase in the Consumer Price Index with the initial escalation to be effective from January 1, 1972 with no decrease where in a year there is a reduction in the Index; to amend the Department of Veterans Affairs Act to provide that regulations made under paragraph 6(1)(e) of that Act may be amended at any time during the first six months of 1972 with effect from January 1, 1972; and to provide further for other related and consequential matters.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), it was ordered,—That the Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1969 and the year ended March 31, 1970, and the Reports of the Auditor General thereon, together with the evidence adduced by the Committee during the Second and Third Sessions of the 28th Parliament, be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Benson,—That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. Bell, moved in amendment thereto,—That all the words after "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "while acknowledging certain beneficial provisions in the budget proposals, this House regrets the failure of the government to bring forth effective measures to relieve unemployment, to provide incentive for Canadian investment in Canadian development or to propose personal tax relief for stimulation of the economy."

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Saltsman, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved in amendment to the said proposed

amendment,—That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"it being the view of this House that a substantial reduction in personal income tax on low and middle incomes should replace the tax cuts and other hand-outs to corporations."

And debate arising thereon;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Southam and McBride for Messrs. Cadieu and Badanai on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Stafford and Trudel for Messrs. Deakon and Robinson on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Messrs. Lundrigan and Howard (Skeena) for Messrs. Schumacher and Skoberg on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley) and Badanai for Messrs. Peters and Borrie on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Nystrom for Mr. Burton on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Andras, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copies of Order in Council P.C. 1972-756 dated April 25, 1972, amending Part II of the Schedule to the Hazardous Products Act, pursuant to section 8(3) of the said Act, chapter H-3, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/160B.

By Mr. Jamieson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Canadian National Railways for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 40 of the Canadian National Railways Act, chapter C-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/96.

By Mr. Jamieson,—Report of the Canadian National Railways Securities Trust for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 17 of the Canadian National Railways Capital Revision Act, chapter 311, R.S.C., 1952. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/101.

By Mr. Jamieson,—Report to Parliament of the Auditors on the Accounts of the Canadian National Railways System for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant

to section 40 of the Canadian National Railways Act, chapter C-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/97.

At 10.30 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 51

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

And on the motion of Mr. Marshall, seconded by Mr. Crouse, in amendment thereto,—That all the words after “That” be struck out and there be substituted the following:

“this House, deeply conscious of the need to increase the Old Age Security pension so as to reflect the full increase in the Consumer Price Index since January 1, 1967 to date with adjustments to the Guaranteed Income Supplement, is of the opinion that the Government should consider the advisability of introducing appropriate amendments to effect such changes to the present limited terms of the Bill.”

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the Chair recognizes the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre I might refer to the ruling that I indicated I would make when this matter was before the House on Wednesday last. At that time the honourable Member for Humber-St.

George's-St. Barbe proposed an amendment to the motion for second reading of Bill C-207, an Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, in the following words: “this House, deeply conscious of the need to increase the Old Age Security pension so as to reflect the full increase in the Consumer Price Index since January 1, 1967, to date with adjustments to the Guaranteed Income Supplement, is of the opinion that the government should consider the advisability of introducing appropriate amendments to effect such changes to the present limited terms of the bill.”

At that time, as recorded at page 2154 of *Hansard*, the Chair indicated certain misgivings about the form of the proposed amendment and suggested that the amendment did not appear to meet the requirements of a reasoned amendment, either in form or in purport. At page 527 of May's 17th edition three rules are set down concerning the categories or, better still, the forms of a reasoned amendment. The descriptions of the categories or forms of that kind of amendment are as follows: “(1) It may be declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill.

(2) It may express opinions as to any circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution of the bill, or otherwise opposed to its progress.

(3) It may seek further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence."

The learned author goes on to state: "Such amendments have tended in modern times to become rather stereotyped and are confined generally to the first two categories."

Although category (3), as described by the author, may have become obsolescent in the British House of Commons, a type of that category of amendment continues in our practice under the form of a motion to refer the subject-matter of a bill to a committee. Citation 386 of Beauchesne's fourth edition makes reference to that.

As stated on Wednesday last, and again in the description of reasoned amendments as found in May's, the proposed amendment is not contrary to or opposed in any shape or form to the principle of Bill C-207, nor is it opposed to the progress of the bill. It does seem to me that unless some of the conditions which I have outlined are met, the motion proposed by the honourable Member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe cannot be deemed to be a reasoned amendment. I therefore regret that I cannot accept it.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs of Bill C-208, An Act to amend the Pension Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act, the Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act and the Department of Veterans Affairs Act, to provide for the annual adjustment of pensions and allowances payable thereunder.

Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), seconded by Mr. Munro, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time

and be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

[At 4.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Notices of Motions)

Mr. Forrestall, seconded by Mr. Crouse moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the development, encouragement and maintenance of a co-ordinated, comprehensive, and long-range national program for the recovery and use of the resources of Canada's sea-coast waters and continental shelves; and to this end, effectively utilize the scientific and engineering knowledge and skills of the public service and government agencies and co-operate with private investment enterprise in the exploration, technological development and industrial use of the resources of the marine environment of Canada.—(Notice of Motion No. 5).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Munro, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Report of the Department of National Health and Welfare for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1970, pursuant to section 13 of the Department of National Health and Welfare Act, chapter N-9, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/18.

At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until Monday at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 52

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, MAY 15, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Pursuant to Standing Order 43, on motion of Mr. Howard (Skeena), seconded by Mr. Barnett, it was resolved,—That this House herewith declares that the movement of oil by tanker along the coast of British Columbia from Valdez in Alaska to Cherry Point in Washington is inimical to Canadian interests especially those of an environmental nature; and further

That this Resolution be forthwith transmitted to the Government of the United States of America in order that that Government be apprised of the concern that the House of Commons of Canada has about the proposed movement of oil.

Mr. Basford, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-209, An Act to provide additional financing mechanisms and institutions for the residential mortgage market in Canada, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to provide additional

mechanisms and institutions for the residential mortgage market in Canada; to establish the Residential Mortgage Market Corporation and provide for its objects, capitalization, powers and directors; and further to authorize the Government of Canada to purchase shares of the Corporation in an amount not to exceed one hundred million dollars and the Minister of Finance to make loans to the Corporation in an amount not to exceed at any time the sum of three hundred million dollars.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Benson,—That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

And on the motion of Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. Bell, in amendment thereto,—That all the words after "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"while acknowledging certain beneficial provisions in the budget proposals, this House regrets the failure of the government to bring forth effective measures to relieve unemployment, to provide incentive for Canadian investment in Canadian development or to propose personal tax relief for stimulation of the economy."

And on the motion of Mr. Saltzman, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

“it being the view of this House that a substantial reduction in personal income tax on low and middle incomes should replace the tax cuts and other hand-outs to corporations.”.

And debate continuing;

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to “Presenting Reports from Standing and Special Committees”.

Mr. Forget, from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Friday, May 12, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, and has agreed to report it without amendment.

A copy of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence relating to this Bill (*Issue No. 5*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 14 to the Journals*).

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Benson,—That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

And on the motion of Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. Bell, in amendment thereto,—That all the words after “That” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

“while acknowledging certain beneficial provisions in the budget proposals, this House regrets the failure of the government to bring forth effective measures to relieve unemployment, to provide incentive for Canadian investment in Canadian development or to propose personal tax relief for stimulation of the economy.”

And on the motion of Mr. Saltzman, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

“it being the view of this House that a substantial reduction in personal income tax on low and middle incomes should replace the tax cuts and other hand-outs to corporations.”.

After further debate, at 9.45 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker interrupted the debate pursuant to Standing Order 60(6) and the question being put on the said proposed amendment to the amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 18)

YEAS

Messrs.

Barnett,	Douglas,	Howard (Skeena),	Lewis,	Rondeau,
Beaudoin,	Fortin,	Knight,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Rowland,
Benjamin,	Gauthier,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Matte,	Saltzman,
Blackburn,	Gilbert,	North Centre),	Nystrom,	Skoberg,
Brewin,	Gleave,	Lambert	Orlikow,	Thomson
Broadbent,	Godin,	(Bellechasse),	Peters,	(Battleford-
Burton,	Harding,	Laprise,	Rodrigue,	Kindersley)—31.

NAYS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Blouin,	Comtois,	Dinsdale,	Gendron,
Alexander,	Borrie,	Corbin,	Drury,	Gervais,
Alkenbrack,	Boulanger,	Corriveau,	Dubé,	Gillespie,
Andras,	Breau,	Côté (Longueuil),	Dupras,	Goyer,
Baldwin,	Buchanan,	Crossman,	Duquet,	Gray,
Barrett,	Caccia,	Crouse,	Fairweather,	Guay
Basford,	Cadieu,	Cullen,	Faulkner,	(St. Boniface),
Bécharde,	Cantin,	Cyr,	Flemming,	Guay (Lévis),
Beer,	Chappell,	Davis,	Forest,	Guilbault,
Bell,	Chrétien,	Deachman,	Forget,	Harkness,
Benson,	Clermont,	Deakon,	Forrestall,	Hees,
Bigg,	Coates,	Diefenbaker,	Foster,	Hellyer,

Hogarth,	Lessard	Marchand	Reid,	Sulatycky,
Hopkins,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	(Kamloops-	Ritchie,	Sullivan,
Howard (Okanagan	Lind,	Cariboo),	Rochon,	Thomas
Boundary),	Loiselle,	Marshall,	Roy (Timmins),	(Maisonneuve-
Howe,	Lundrigan,	Mazankowski,	Roy (Laval),	Rosemont),
Isabelle,	MacDonald	Monteith,	Ryan,	Thomas
Jamieson,	(Egmont),	Morison,	Rynard,	(Moncton),
Jerome,	MacEachen,	Muir,	Schumacher,	Thompson
Kaplan,	MacGuigan,	Murta,	Scott,	(Red Deer),
Laflamme,	MacInnis (Cape	Nesbitt,	Serré,	Tolmie,
Laing	Breton-East	Noble,	Sharp,	Trudeau,
(Vancouver South),	Richmond),	Noël,	Skoreyko,	Trudel,
Lambert	Macquarrie,	Nowlan,	Smith	Turner
(Edmonton West),	McBride,	O'Connell,	(Northumberland-	(London East),
Lang (Saskatoon-	McCleave,	Olson,	Miramichi),	Turner (Ottawa-
Humboldt),	McCutcheon,	Osler,	Smith	Carleton),
Langlois,	McGrath,	Ouellet,	(Saint-Jean),	Wahn,
Laniel,	McIntosh,	Paproski,	Southam,	Watson,
La Salle,	McKinley,	Pelletier,	Stafford,	Weatherhead,
Leblanc (Laurier),	McNulty,	Pepin,	Stanbury,	Whelan,
Lefebvre,	McQuaid,	Perrault,	Stanfield,	Whicher,
Legault,	Mahoney,	Portelance,	Stewart	Whiting,
Lessard (LaSalle),	Major,	Pringle,	(Marquette),	Woolliams,
	Marceau,	Prud'homme,	St. Pierre,	Yanakis—158.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Skoberg for Mr. Howard (Skeena) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Blackburn for Mr. Benjamin on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Messrs. Corriveau, Major, Langlois, Legault, Marceau, Foster, Rynard, Murta and Hopkins for Messrs. Allmand, Haidasz, LeBlanc (Rimouski), Roy (Laval), Otto, Robinson, McCleave, McGrath and Weatherhead on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) for Mr. Gilbert on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Deakon for Mr. Stafford on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Benjamin for Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, —Report of the Superintendent of Insurance on the Administration of the Pension Benefits Standards Act, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 22 of the said Act, chapter P-8, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/207.

At 10.10 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 53

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday, the Right Honourable Member for Prince Albert proposed to move a motion under Standing Order 43 in the following words: "That the subject-matter of public statements made by the honourable Member, and in particular those which are of a disparaging nature to the integrity and independence of the bench, be immediately referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs."

Before putting the question, the Chair expressed reservations about the procedural acceptability of the motion in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 51. Although there appeared to be unanimous consent among honourable Members to proceed with the debate, the Chair undertook to look into the procedural aspects of the proposed motion.

It should be pointed out that the unanimous consent of the House contemplated by Standing Order 43 has reference only to the setting aside of the notice requirements provided in Standing Order 42. That is the sole purpose of the Standing Order. It does not set aside the ordinary rules applicable to the form and content of motions.

Thus, when a motion is proposed under the terms of Standing Order 43 the Chair has an obligation to ensure

that the ordinary usages of the House are observed. Even after the most serious and exhaustive consideration of the matter, the Chair has the same reservations as to the procedural aspects of a motion of this kind.

In the circumstances I would hope that it might be found possible either to redraft the motion and propose it in other terms or, if it is the unanimous desire of the House, to have a debate on this matter in some other form, perhaps under the provisions of another Standing Order or procedure. As honourable Members know, there have been discussions in this regard. Hopefully these consultations will result in due course in some understanding between all parties and individuals concerned. However, this is not for the Chair to decide, and for the moment I would have to leave this in the hands of honourable Members themselves.

Mr. Wahn, from the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Your Committee recommends that it be granted permission to adjourn from place to place within Canada from June 4 to June 9, 1972 in relation to the White

Paper on Defence referred to the Committee on February 24, 1972 and that the necessary supporting staff do accompany the Committee.

Mr. Wahn, from the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following Votes listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Votes 1, 5, 10, L15 and 20 relating to the Department of External Affairs;

Votes 25, 30, L35, L40 and L45 relating to the Canadian International Development Agency;

Vote 50 relating to the International Joint Commission;

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30 relating to the Department of National Defence; and

Vote 35 relating to Defence Construction (1951) Limited.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues No. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 15 to the Journals).

Mr. Howard (Skeena), seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-210, An Act to amend the Canada Development Corporation Act (mineral processing), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-211, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses; to provide under the circumstances prescribed in the Act, for the reimbursement of certain expenses of candidates and of certain costs of registered parties.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), seconded by Mr. Munro,—That Bill C-208, An Act to amend the Pension Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act, the Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act and the Department of Veterans Affairs Act, to provide for the annual adjustment of pensions and allowances payable thereunder, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

By unanimous consent, the Order for second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs of Bill C-9, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (abolition of corporal punishment), was discharged and the said bill withdrawn.

By unanimous consent, orders numbered two and three were allowed to stand.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration of Bill C-18, An Act to amend the Canadian Citizenship Act;

Mr. Allmand, seconded by Mr. Prud'homme, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

And debate arising thereon;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: Before we call it six o'clock perhaps honourable Members would allow the Chair to make a brief ruling in reference to a matter which was raised earlier in the House today.

Earlier today the honourable Member for York South (Mr. Lewis), in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 17, gave notice of his intention to rise on a question of privilege at the opening of our sittings. In his notice the honourable Member indicated that he intended to refer to a motion proposed yesterday by the Right Honourable Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) under Standing Order 43. The honourable Member for York South suggested that the words used by the Right Honourable Member were in breach of parliamentary privilege. On this basis the honourable Member proposed the following motion: "That the false charges made by the Right Honourable Member for Prince Albert, as recorded on page 2243 of *Hansard* for Monday, May 15,

1972, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for consideration and report."

The Chair is required to determine whether there is a *prima facie* case of privilege. If a ruling were made in the affirmative, the honourable Member's motion could be put and debated and the House itself would determine whether the matter should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for consideration and report.

The suggestion made by the honourable Member for York South is therefore that the words spoken in the House by the Right Honourable Member for Prince Albert found a *prima facie* case of privilege. When the matter was first raised in the House this afternoon and indeed when the motion was proposed to the House by the Right Honourable Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) yesterday, the Chair expressed its reluctance at finding that the statements or conduct of honourable Members should be referred to a committee for scrutiny. This is a feeling which I am sure is shared by all honourable Members. It is certainly a view which is based on a long standing tradition in this House. I am advised that the last instance when a specific charge made by one Member against another was accepted by the Chair for consideration as a question of privilege, goes back to the year 1924. On that occasion and on the four other occasions prior to 1924 when such a question went before a committee of the House, the charge against the Member had reference to alleged wrongdoings.

The procedural position was explained clearly by Mr. Speaker Michener in a ruling dated June 1959 and reported at page 582 of the *Journals* of the House of Commons for that year. The then Speaker ruled that a charge in specific terms had to be made before a *prima facie* case of privilege could be found. The motion proposed by the honourable Member for York South (Mr. Lewis) does not meet this test. His motion takes issue with what the honourable Member calls the false charges made by the Right Honourable Member for Prince Albert. The assertion made by the honourable Member for York South cannot be construed in my estimation as being a specific charge as set forth from the Chair on many previous occasions and in particular by Mr. Speaker Michener in the ruling to which I have just referred. We are dealing here essentially with a matter of debate.

I take the liberty to repeat the suggestion made yesterday that this is essentially a matter of debate. I feel that honourable Members were suggesting a more acceptable procedure when they themselves suggested yesterday that the matter might be the subject of a debate under another Standing Order or procedure. If there continues to be a disposition by honourable Members to debate this question, I assume that by agreement, simple arrangements can be made to achieve this purpose.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), seconded by Mr. Munro,—That Bill C-208, An Act to amend the Pension Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Civilian War Pensions and

Allowance Act, the Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act and the Department of Veterans Affairs Act, to provide for the annual adjustment of pensions and allowances payable thereunder, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By unanimous consent, the House proceeded to the consideration of the report stage of Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, and of the following motions:

Motion numbered (1) standing in the name of Mr. Rodrigue,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by inserting a comma after the word "who" in Clause 2 at line 23, page 1 and adding the following:

"has reached age 60."

Motion numbered (2) standing in the name of Mr. Laprise,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by deleting the word "who" in Clause 2 at line 23, page 1 and substituting therefor the following:

"even if his age is lower than the provisions of the present Act if the spouse receives a monthly pension by virtue of the said Act."

Motion numbered (3) standing in the name of Mr. Fortin,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by deleting from Clause 2 lines 20 to 23, page 1 inclusive and substituting therefor the following:

"3(1) Under the provisions of the present Act and regulations, a monthly pension may be paid to every person, even though the age is lower than that provided for in the present Act once the person reaches age 60, if the spouse receives a monthly pension."

Motion numbered (4) standing in the name of Mr. Gauthier,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended (a) by deleting from Clause 3 the words "eighty dollars" at line 3, page 2 and substituting therefor the words "two hundred dollars" (b) by making consequential amendments to Clause 5.

Mr. Speaker ruled the said proposed motions out of order in that they involved an additional expenditure of money and thereby infringed upon the initiative of the Crown.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Rynard, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, moved,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by striking out the words “eighty dollars” at line 3, page 2 and substituting the words “ninety dollars”.

And debate arising thereon;

The Order being read for the report stage of Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, as reported with amendments from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs;

By unanimous consent, Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), moved,—That Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, be amended by striking out lines 24 to 29 on page 5 thereof.

The said motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), the said bill, as amended, was concurred in at the report stage.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Laing (Vancouver South) for Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Rondeau, seconded by Mr. Gauthier, moved in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, be not read a third time but that the said bill be referred back to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for the purpose of reconsidering Section 44 of the said bill and in particular paragraph (a).

And debate arising thereon;

Ordered,—That any recorded divisions necessary to dispose, without debate, of the amendment now before the House and third reading of said bill be deferred until after *Routine Proceedings* Wednesday, May 17, 1972.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10:22 o'clock p.m., the question “That this House do now adjourn” was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4) (b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Nowlan, Alkenbrack, Moore and Cadieu for Messrs. Danforth, Downey, Korchinski and Horner on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Smith (Saint-Jean), Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo), Cullen, Rochon and Lind for Messrs. Badanai, Haidasz, Hymmen, Allmand and Murphy on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Burton for Mr. Knight on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. MacDonald (Egmont) and Tolmie for Messrs. Murta and Corriveau on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Messrs. Trudel and Legault for Messrs. Beer and Lesard (LaSalle) on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Burton for Mr. Nystrom on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. McCleave for Mr. MacKay on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. LeBlanc (Rimouski), Roy (Laval) and Allmand for Messrs. Hopkins, Legault and Langlois on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Béchard for Mr. De Bané on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Messrs. Forget and Lambert (Edmonton West) for Messrs. Legault and Thomas (Moncton) on the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Messrs. Badanai, Haidasz, Hymmen, Allmand and Murphy for Messrs. Smith (Saint-Jean), Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo), Cullen, Rochon and Lind on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Messrs. Forest, Deakon and Portelance for Messrs. Loiselle, Roy (Timmins) and Stewart (Cochrane) on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Mr. Robinson for Mr. Faulkner on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Messrs. Lachance and Forget for Messrs. Guilbault and De Bané on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

At 10.50 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 54

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Leblanc (Laurier), from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following Votes, as listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Vote 15 relating to the Auditor General;

Vote 1 relating to the Governor General and Lieutenant-Governors;

Votes 1 and 5 relating to the Privy Council Office;

Vote 15 relating to the Commissioner of Official Languages;

Vote 25 relating to the Public Service Staff Relations Board;

Vote 1 relating to the Ministry of State for Science and Technology;

Vote 5 relating to the Science Council of Canada;

Vote 105 relating to the Public Service Commission;

Votes 1, 5 and 10 relating to the Department of Supply and Services;

Vote 15 relating to Canadian Arsenals Limited;

Vote 20 relating to the Canadian Commercial Corporation;

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15 and 20 relating to the Treasury Board; and

Votes 25, 30 and 35 relating to the National Research Council of Canada.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1, 2, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 16 to the Journals*).

Mr. Reid, from the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered Vote 60 relating to

the Canadian Radio-Television Commission, listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973.

On April 18, 1972, your Committee heard Mr. Pierre Juneau, Chairman of the Canadian Radio-Television Commission and on April 25, 1972, your Committee heard a deputation (the Mayor and Town Solicitor) from Mississauga, Ontario in relation to the C.R.T.C.'s Mississauga Cable Decision 72-65.

On the basis of these hearings, your Committee submits the following findings:

1. Your Committee understands that the Community of Mississauga will appeal the Decision under Section 23 of the Broadcasting Act to the Governor in Council. Your Committee submits that the Governor in Council should set aside the original award, or should refer the issue back to the Commission for reconsideration and hearing, together with its opinion that more heed should be paid to the wishes of the Community of Mississauga being served.

2. The Community of Mississauga is acutely dissatisfied with the C.R.T.C.'s Cable Decision 72-65. The Community's Ratepayers Associations are unanimous in their criticisms of the C.R.T.C.'s decision and endorsed the Town Council's opposition to that Decision. The M.P. for Peel South has assured your Committee that there is strong support within the Community of Mississauga behind the municipality's decision to appeal the C.R.T.C. Decision 72-65.

3. The C.R.T.C. did not give the reasoning behind their Decision. No one is certain how C.R.T.C. Decision 72-65 fits in with the published C.R.T.C. Cable Policy of 16 July 1971—"POLICY STATEMENT ON CABLE TELEVISION".

4. Your Committee also believes that the C.R.T.C. ought to publish the reasons for its decisions. In the Mississauga decision, only the names of the applicants, and their territories, were provided. There were no reasons given for the awards. Your Committee recommends that all decisions of the C.R.T.C., especially where there are contested applications, ought to be accompanied by detailed statements of the reasoning behind them, as is now provided by the courts, and by other regulatory bodies such as the Canadian Transport Commission.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 4 to 7 inclusive*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 17 to the Journals).

Mr. Munro, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of "A Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the non-medical use of drugs—(Cannabis)"—(Chairman—Gerald Le Dain, Esq.,). (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-4/105.

Mr. Reid, seconded by Mr. Blair, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-212, An Act to amend the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (rules), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 33, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Operations Research Industries, a study and recommendations on the design of a management-information system supporting the departmental planning, programming and budgeting system, undertaken for the Department of Manpower and Immigration in the fiscal year 1967-68, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the 1st Session of this Parliament,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 44, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for the tabling of the Report on Low Cost Housing prepared by Professor Melvin Charney for a task force on low cost housing appointed by the Minister of Urban Affairs,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Resolved,—That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence, memoranda, special study reports between the Government of Canada or any department thereof and the Government of the Province of Ontario relating to the question of the second international airport in the Province of Ontario.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 51.—Mr. Howe*).

Ordered,—That there be laid before this House a copy of all papers including correspondence between any Indian band, provincial or national Indian organizations and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and/or any officials in his Department regarding the James Bay Development.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 57.—Mr. Orlikow*).

The Order being read for resuming debate on the motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-2, An Act to amend the

Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act be now read a third time and do pass;

And on the motion of Mr. Rondeau, seconded by Mr. Gauthier, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the

Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, be not read a third time but that the said bill be referred back to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for the purpose of reconsidering Section 44 of the said bill and in particular paragraph (a).

Pursuant to Special Order made Tuesday, May 16, 1972, the question being put on the said proposed amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 19)

YEAS

Messrs.

Dionne, Fortin,	Gauthier, Godin,	Lambert (Bellechasse),	Laprise, Latulippe, Matte,	Rodrigue, Rondeau, Tétrault—11.
--------------------	---------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------------

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander, Allmand, Asselin, Baldwin, Barnett, Barrett, Béchar, Beer, Bell, Benjamin, Benson, Bigg, Blackburn, Blair, Blouin, Borrie, Boulanger, Brewin, Broadbent, Buchanan, Burton, Caccia, Cadieu, Cafik, Cantin, Carter, Chappell, Chrétien, Clermont, Coates, Cobbe, Comeau, Comtois, Corbin, Corriveau, Côté (Richelieu), Crossman, Crouse,	Cullen, Cyr, Danforth, Danson, Davis, Deachman, Deakon, De Bané, Diefenbaker, Dinsdale, Douglas, Drury, Dubé, Dupras, Émard, Flemming, Forest, Forget, Foster, Gendron, Gervais, Gibson, Gilbert, Gillespie, Goyer, Gray, Grills, Guay (St. Boniface), Guay (Lévis), Guilbault, Hales, Harding, Harkness, Hees, Hopkins, Hornor, Howard (Okanagan Boundary),	Howe, Jamieson, Jerome, Knight, Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), Knowles (Norfolk- Haldimand), Korchinski, Lachance, Laflamme, Lajoie, Lang (Saskatoon- Humboldt), Langlois, Laniel, La Salle, Leblanc (Laurier), LeBlanc (Rimouski), Lefebvre, Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean), L'Heureux, Loiselle, Lundrigan, MacDonald (Egmont), MacEachen, MacGuigan, MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond), MacInnis (Mrs.), MacKay, MacLean, Macquarrie, MacRae, McBride,	McCutcheon, McGrath, McIntosh, McKinley, McNulty, McQuaid, Mahoney, Major, Marceau, Marchand (Langelier), Marchand (Kamloops- Cariboo), Marshall, Mather, Mazankowski, Monteith, Moore, Muir, Munro, Murphy, Murta, Nielsen, Noble, Nystrom, O'Connell, Orlikow, Osler, Otto, Ouellet, Paproski, Pelletier, Penner, Portelance, Pringle, Prud'homme, Reid,	Richard, Richardson, Ritchie, Roberts, Robinson, Rochon, Rock, Roy (Timmins), Roy (Laval), Ryan, Rynard, Saltzman, Schumacher, Scott, Serré, Sharp, Simpson, Skoberg, Skoreyko, Smerchanski, Smith (Northumberland- Miramichi), Smith (Saint-Jean), Southam, Stafford, Stanbury, Stanfield, Stewart (Marquette), Stewart (Okanagan- Kootenay), St. Pierre, Sulatycky, Sullivan, Thomas (Maisonneuve- Rosemont),
--	---	---	---	---

Thomas
(Moncton),
Thompson
(Red Deer),

Tolmie,
Trudeau,
Trudel,

Turner
(London East),
Turner (Ottawa-
Carleton),

Wahn,
Watson,
Whelan,
Whicher,

Whiting,
Woolliams,
Yewchuk—187.

And the question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, was again considered at the report stage.

Whereupon, the House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Rynard, seconded by Mr. Baldwin,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by striking out the words “eighty dollars” at line 3, page 2 and substituting the words “ninety dollars”.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: When the House adjourned last night, a point of order had been raised in relation to motion numbered 5 standing in the name of the honourable Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard). The suggestion had been made that this motion might be difficult to accept from a procedural standpoint. I have looked at the matter and, before making a ruling, I am prepared to hear argument in relation to the point which I made last night.

Mr. SPEAKER: If that is the disposition of the House, a ruling will be made formally. Referring honourable Members to citation 246 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, I have to conclude that the motion cannot be put.

Mr. Rynard, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, moved,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by striking out the word “is” at lines 14 and 24, page 2 and substituting the words “shall not be less than”.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived, on division.

Mr. Rynard, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, moved,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by striking out (a) the words “sixty-seven dollars and twelve cents” at lines 12 and 13 and at lines 23 and 24, page 4 and substituting the words “seventy-two dollars and seventy cents”; and (b) the words “fifty-nine dollars and sixty-two cents” at lines 30 and 31, page 4 and substituting the words “sixty-five dollars and five cents”.

And debate arising thereon;

RULING BY MR. ACTING SPEAKER

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Laniel): Before I render a decision on motion numbered 7 put forward by the honourable Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) perhaps I should give notice of the first impression of the Chair regarding the acceptability of this motion. In my opinion it would require additional expenditure on the part of the Crown, and on this basis I would have difficulty in accepting the motion. If honourable Members have opinions on the acceptability of that motion I would like to hear them. Otherwise I will make a decision at this time.

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Laniel): Possibly at this time I should express my regret to the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) for not calling him back to order. The Chair has been trying to follow his argument, at the same time looking at the clause itself. I do not think I succeeded in finding any connection that would change the decision of the Chair. After what has been said by the honourable Member for Peace River at the end of his remarks on motion numbered 7, again the Chair can only repeat that this amendment would result in increased payments from public funds.

If honourable Members refer once more to Beauchesne, citation 246, they will see arguments there that are quite eloquent as to the non-acceptability of such an amendment at this time.

On motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), the said bill was concurred in at the report stage.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Rynard, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That all the words after “That” be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

“Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be referred back to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs with an instruction to consider the advisability of inserting therein the following clause:

(1) The Governor in Council may, by order, increase the Old Age Security pension so as to reflect the full increase in the Consumer Price Index since the 1st January 1967 to date with adjustments to the Guaranteed Income Supplement.

(2) No order may be made under subsection (1) until the proposed text of the order has been laid before the House of Commons by a member of the Queen's

Privy Council for Canada and the making of the order has been approved by a resolution of the House of Commons.

(3) Expenditures required under an order made under subsection (1) shall be paid for out of monies to be appropriated by Parliament."

RULING BY MR. ACTING SPEAKER

MR. ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Laniel): I thank honourable Members for their contribution in helping the Chair make a decision. I agree that the amendment before us is well drafted in that it could be looked at as a proper case.

I listened to the argument of the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that statistics from Statistics Canada might not correspond to the Consumer Price Index for all kinds of reasons. This was getting into the debate itself which the Chair cannot do and cannot use as an argument.

In my opinion, the decision that has to be rendered at this time is based on two points. The first point is to try and determine whether the amendment departs from the principle adopted on second reading. The honourable Member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) referred to an amendment that was accepted by the Chair last night. That amendment proposed to refer a bill back to committee to amend one particular clause. Over the years it has been the practice to accept at third reading stage a six month hoist amendment or refer a bill back to a committee for the purpose of reconsidering one particular clause. In this case, the Chair is wondering whether the amendment would not tend to change the principle which has been approved on second reading. The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) referred to citation 415 of Beauchesne at page 287. He even read paragraph four of that citation which, to my mind, is very clear. I might perhaps repeat it: "On the third reading of a bill an amendment to refer back to the Committee of the Whole must not tend to change the principle approved on second reading."

Basing myself on this paragraph, I find myself wondering whether the committee itself would have the power to deal with such an amendment. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment which has been proposed is really one which brings in a new subject, a new approach, if one considers the debate which has taken place and the study which has been carried out at the earlier stages.

Again, if we read citation 418, we find a similar thought expressed in the following terms: "The question for the third reading is put immediately after the report from the Committee of the Whole. All amendments which may be moved on a second reading of a bill may be moved on the third reading with the restriction that they cannot deal with any matter which is not contained in the bill."

The Chair is wondering whether the proposal made in this amendment does not involve a new matter, a new approach to the bill itself.

Honourable Members might also refer to Beauchesne at the bottom of page 527 where the rules which govern reasoned amendments are set out. We find that the first principle to be taken into consideration when drafting or accepting an amendment is the rule of relevancy.

There is another aspect with which the Chair has to be concerned. It is the financial aspect. I wonder whether the amendment in the form in which it is presented is not seeking to do indirectly what the honourable Member cannot do directly. Citation 246(3) of Beauchesne's, Fourth Edition, makes it clear that honourable Members should not try to do things indirectly which they cannot do directly. I think I should read this paragraph: "The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication to which the royal demand or recommendation is attached must be treated as laying down once for all (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of the charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications. In relation to the standard thereby fixed, an amendment infringes the financial initiative of the Crown not only if it increases the amount but also if it extends the objects and purposes or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication by which the Crown has demanded or recommended a charge."

Although the other citations from Beauchesne, 415 and 418, made me hesitate about accepting the amendment before us, having regard to the rule of relevancy, my decision is confirmed by what is contained in Citation 246. Looking again at the amendment I can only conclude that it puts forward a new financial proposition, one which I cannot accept at this time.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt),—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Fortin, seconded by Mr. Dionne, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, to consider the possibility of:

(a) lowering the age of entitlement to an Old Age Security pension to 60;

(b) granting an Old Age Security pension to all persons even if his age is lower than the provisions of the present Act, provided that the spouse receives a monthly pension by virtue of the said Act;

(c) eliminating the principle of a supplement and establishing the basic amount at \$200.00 per month.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I also wish to thank the honourable Member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) for his comments.

I am afraid the honourable Member has failed to differentiate between the two types of amendments: the one which allows the House to consider the suggestion that a bill be referred to a committee for one of its sections to be re-examined or reconsidered, and the other one which is called a reasoned amendment in English and which is used by a Member to indicate why he intends to vote against the principle of the bill.

The reasoned amendment here gives a detailed account of the reasons why the honourable Member intends to vote against the bill as such on second or third reading. There is no question then of referring the bill to a committee but simply of saying why the House should vote against the bill as such.

I think that the honourable Member is aware of the precedents in this respect.

The other type of amendment suggests that a clause of a bill be referred to a committee for consideration and it is possible of course to give instructions to a committee to consider any clause. Unfortunately, the instructions to be given to the committee must comply with our Standing Orders and a well established precedent is that which is found in Beauchesne in citation 415. I should like to quote from it and to refer honourable Members to paragraph (4). I quote: "On the third reading of a bill, an amendment to refer back to the Committee of the Whole must not tend to change the principle approved on the second reading.

418. ...On the second reading of a bill, an amendment may be moved expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction or prosecution, or seeking further information in relation to the bill by committees or commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence, or the opinion of judges. This cannot be done on the third reading because it is not directly connected with any provision of the bill."

The principle expounded by the author of citation 418 is to the effect that there should be a strict relevance in the case of an amendment moved at the third or second reading stage.

The 3rd paragraph of citation 246 of the Fourth Edition of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms reads as follows:

"(3) The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the royal demand of recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down *once for all* ... not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications. ..."

I do not want to read the whole paragraph, but in quoting paragraph 3 of citation 246, I wanted simply

to remind the honourable Member that it is not possible to instruct the committee to do something the House itself cannot undertake, which the committee cannot be authorized to do, that is to amend the financial orders of the Crown.

I could read other citations, including No. 252, but I do not think it is necessary to do so. It is obvious to me that honourable Members could, if they so wished, simply move an amendment to the effect that a particular clause of the bill be reconsidered. A motion to this effect would be acceptable, contrary to that moved by the honourable Member.

Moreover, I sincerely believe that it violates our Standing Rules and I do not think that it could be acceptable to the Chair.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 6(5) (a), Mr. Jerome, seconded by Mr. Watson, moved,—That the hours of sitting be extended beyond six o'clock this day until debate upon third reading of Bill C-207, is concluded.

And more than ten Members having objected, the said motion was, pursuant to Standing Order 6(5) (b), deemed to have been withdrawn.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt),—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate continuing;

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to "Routine Proceedings".

Mr. Foster, from the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Tuesday, May 16, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-208, An Act to amend the Pension Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act, the Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act and the Department of Veterans Affairs Act to provide for the annual adjustment of pensions and allowances payable thereunder, and has agreed to report it without amendment.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence relating to this Bill (Issue No. 6) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 18 to the Journals).

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt),—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate continuing;

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That consideration of Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be interrupted not less than one hour after Government Orders have been called and every question necessary to dispose of the said bill shall be put forthwith.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Nystrom for Mr. Broadbent on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Messrs. Whicher and L'Heureux for Messrs. Forget and Francis on the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Robinson for Mr. Tolmie on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Otto for Mr. Marceau on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Chrétien, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Copy of Ordinances, made by the Council of the Yukon Territory, assented to between February 11, 1972 and March 30, 1972, pursuant to section 20(1) of the Yukon Act, chapter Y-2, R.S.C., 1970, together with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1972-992, dated May 9, 1972, approving same.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/263.

By Mr. Chrétien, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Copy of Ordinances, chapters 10 to 12, assented to March 17, 1972, pursuant to section 16(1) of the Northwest Territories Act, chapter N-22, R.S.C., 1970, together with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1972-991, dated May 9, 1972, approving same.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/200A.

By Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on Actuarial Examination of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Account in the Consolidated Revenue Fund as at December 31, 1969, pursuant to section 25 of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act, chapter R-11, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).— Sessional Paper No. 284-1/232.

At 6.28 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 55

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Forget, from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following votes listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Votes 1 and 5 relating to the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs;

Votes 10 and L15 relating to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation;

Votes 20, 25 and L30 relating to the National Capital Commission; and

Vote 25 relating to the Prices and Incomes Commission.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 19 to the Journals).

Mr. Blair, from the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following Votes listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Vote 1 relating to the Senate;

Vote 5 relating to the House of Commons; and

Vote 10 relating to the Library of Parliament.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1, 2 and 3*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 20 to the Journals).

Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and

other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil thereof. Done at London, Moscow and Washington, February 11, 1971. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/37A.

Mr. Stanbury, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Communications of Canada and the European Space Research Organization concerning their Cooperation in the Field of Advanced Space Technology. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/37.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt),—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate continuing;

Pursuant to Special Order made Wednesday, May 17, 1972, Mr. Speaker interrupted the debate and the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

By unanimous consent, Bill C-208, An Act to amend the Pension Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act, the Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act and the Department of Veterans Affairs Act, to provide for the annual adjustment of pensions and allowances payable thereunder, as reported, without amendment, from the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, was concurred in at the report stage.

Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

By unanimous consent, the hour for Private Members' Business was suspended.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of Bill C-211, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses;

Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Macquarrie, seconded by Mr. McKinley, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That all the words after "That" be left out and the following substituted:

"this House, regretting that government delay in introducing Bill C-211 prevents the full operation of a measure dealing with election expenses before January 1st, 1973 and that the bill fails to provide for adequate reform, declines to pass a bill which does not take advantage of present day advances in the mass media and transportation which would provide for a shorter election period and thereby, amongst other things, substantially reduce election expenses."

And a point of order arising thereon; further consideration thereof was deferred.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-211, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.01 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4) (b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Crossman, Marceau, Weatherhead and Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont) for Messrs. Foster, Major, Otto and Roy (Laval) on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Messrs. Jerome, Forest, Deakon, Chappell, McBride and Pringle for Messrs. Stafford, Sullivan, Cyr, Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean), Roy (Timmins) and La Salle on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Caik for Mr. Gibson on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Messrs. Crossman, Yanakis, Horner, Korchinski and Danforth for Messrs. LeBlanc (Rimouski), Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean), Nowlan, Cadieu and Alkenbrack on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Gilbert for Mr. Benjamin on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Financial Statement on the Operations of the Veterans Insurance Act for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 18(2) of the said Act, chapter V-3, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/254.

By Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—Financial Statement on the Operations of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 17(2) of the said Act, chapter 59,

Statutes of Canada, 1951. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/228.

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Return to an Address, dated May 17, 1972, to His Excellency the Governor General, for a copy of all correspondence, memoranda, special study reports between the Government of Canada or any department thereof and the Government of the Province of Ontario relating to the question of the second international airport in the Province of Ontario.—(Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 51).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/51.

At 10.20 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 56

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, MAY 19, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

The Order being read for resuming debate on the motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-211, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections;

And resuming debate on the point of order in relation to the proposed amendment of Mr. Macquarrie, seconded by Mr. McKinley,—That all the words after “That” be left out and the following substituted:

“this House, regretting that government delay in introducing Bill C-211 prevents the full operation of a measure dealing with election expenses before January 1st, 1973 and that the bill fails to provide for adequate reform, declines to pass a bill which does not take advantage of present day advances in the mass media and transportation which would provide for a shorter election period and thereby, amongst other things, substantially reduce election expenses.”.

And debate continuing;

RULING BY MR. ACTING SPEAKER

MR. ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Laniel): Yesterday, Mr. Speaker issued a warning to honourable Members in

his remarks following the moving of an amendment by the honourable Member for Hillsborough. He said that the proliferation of amendments of that kind indicate that honourable Members are really attempting from time to time, under the guise of so-called reasoned amendments, to bring in substantive motions. He went on, as reported at page 2412 of *Hansard*: “I suggest that for some strange reason it seems that in recent weeks and months honourable members have been taken with the idea that perhaps a reasoned amendment is a good way in which to propose a substantive motion which very often does not bear too much immediate and essential relevancy to the principle of the bill.”.

The honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) referred to citation 382 of Beauchesne's in which it is stated: “It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a Bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information in relation to the Bill by Committees, Commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of Judges.”.

Yesterday Mr. Speaker mentioned that these so-called reasoned amendments are intended to give an opportunity to members to place on the record a reason for opposing the principle of the bill. The Chair agrees with this, but questions the interpretations put on this by the honourable Member for Peace River and the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

The honourable Member for Peace River referred to the changes in the rules. Of course the Chair is quite aware that there has been a fast evolution in the past few years particularly since 1968 when rules have been changed. Even though these rules have been amended, I am sure that honourable Members will not ask the Chair to further amend these rules by making a ruling that in itself will tend to modify a long established practice in the House of Commons. The Chair would meet with great difficulties if it were asked to do so. I agree that a new practice has developed, as mentioned by the honourable Member, to send more bills to the committees, making it more easy to give second reading without questioning all the details of a bill in the hope that the committee would have a better opportunity to adopt modification.

This was referred to by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre who said that with the change in the rules we downgraded slightly the second reading stage of a bill, but I do not think this is a reason which should prevent the Chair from making a decision based on past practice, precedent and rules of this House.

There are basic rules we have to follow. Of course, there is little doubt in the mind of the Chair that a reasoned amendment at the second reading stage of a bill involves one of the more difficult of Parliament's proceedings. The invitation which has been made in the past by Mr. Speaker, to have the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization look at this matter, still stands. I am sure honourable Members would benefit from a discussion of this problem outside the House rather than discussing it only in the context of a particular amendment in respect of which the Chair has to make an important decision, because this could prevent some honourable Members, in view of their opinion of the bill itself or the subject-matter under discussion, from expressing a clear view on the whole subject-matter; one might be defending the amendment and another opposing it. If the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization considered this matter outside of this context it might come forward with suggestions useful to honourable Members, the House and the Chair.

Referring again to the difficulty met in respect of a reasoned amendment, I would invite honourable Members to look at page 527 of May's Seventeenth Edition where three rules are set out concerning the form of a reasoned amendment with a description of the categories of that kind of an amendment. It reads as follows: "(1) It may be declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill.

(2) It may express opinions as to any circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution of the bill, or otherwise opposed to its progress.

(3) It may seek further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence.

Such amendments have tended in modern times to become rather stereotyped and are confined generally to the first two categories."

Category No. 3 as described by the author may have become obsolete in the British House of Commons in view of our practice of referring the subject-matter of a bill to a committee.

Citation 386 in Beauchesne's Fourth Edition refers to that type of amendment.

To go back to May's Seventeenth Edition and the citation to which I have already referred, there is a description of the types and classes of amendments which fall into that category referred to as "reasoned". At the foot of page 527 and at the top of page 528 of May's Seventeenth Edition it is stated: "The principle of relevancy in an amendment governs every such motion. The amendment must "strictly relate to the bill which the House, by its order, has resolved upon considering", and must not include in its scope other bills then standing for consideration by the House.

The amendment must not be concerned in detail with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved, nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved in committee; nor is it permissible to propose merely the addition of words to the question, that the bill be now read a second time, as such words must, by implication, attach conditions to the second reading.

An amendment, which amounts to no more than a direct negation of the principle of the bill, is open to objection."

In those three paragraphs the conditions which must be met by a reasoned amendment are stated. In paragraph (1), as cited, one important condition must be met when an amendment is moved to a motion for second and third reading. This is the rule of relevancy.

The amendment, according to the rule of relevancy, must relate strictly to the bill the House is considering at the time. Coming back to the amendment before us, to my mind the first part of the amendment, referring to what the mover calls "government delay in introducing Bill C-211" is quite irrelevant to the principle of the bill. It must be said also that the motion does not claim to oppose the bill on those grounds. Actually the Chair would be tempted to ask itself if it were accepting the arguments made by the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) whether their reasons were valid, and, if so, the reasoned amendment as such might become obsolescent. Later the proposed amendment suggests that there should be a provision

for a shorter election period having regard to advances in mass media and transportation. This again is beyond the terms of the bill before us. What the honourable Member proposes are amendments to the Canada Elections Act, rather than to the Bill, which is before us, Bill C-211. That, to my mind, is the basic weakness of the proposed amendment.

In essence, the honourable Member's suggested reasoned amendment is not declaratory of any proposition adverse to, or differing from, the principle of the bill before us. For those reasons I cannot accept the amendment. May I be permitted, however, to add in conclusion that I hope honourable Members will understand, if the Chair has spent more time than it should have on the arguments made, that it did so in the hope that soon in the coming months honourable Members will have an opportunity to look again at the question of reasoned amendments. Regardless of the decision rendered now I invite honourable Members to look at this question at other times rather than in relation to an amendment which is before the House on a specific bill. Again, as I have said, so far as the amendment is concerned the Chair cannot accept it. This is mainly based on the present rules and practices of the House, on the precedents and on the previous decisions which have been taken. This is the only way, unless the rules of the House are changed, in which we can preserve this institution.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-211, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And debate continuing;

[At 4.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to *Standing Order 15(4)*]

(Public Bills)

By unanimous consent, Order numbered one was allowed to stand.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications of Bill C-16, An Act to amend the Blue Water Bridge Authority Act (public and financial accountability);

Mr. McCutcheon, seconded by Mr. McKinley, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

And debate arising thereon;

24960—21

Mr. Speaker communicated to the House the following letter:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
OTTAWA

19 May 1972.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Wilfred Judson, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 19th day of May at 4.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,

ANDRÉ GARNEAU,
Administrative Secretary to the Governor General.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons,
Ottawa.

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed the following Bills, without any amendment:

Bill C-208, An Act to amend the Pension Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act, the Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act and the Department of Veterans Affairs Act to provide for the annual adjustment of pensions and allowances payable thereunder.

Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act.

A Message was received from the Honourable Wilfred Judson, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, desiring the immediate attendance of the House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker went with the House to the Senate Chamber.

And being returned;

Mr. Speaker reported that when the House did attend the Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, His Honour was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bills:

Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act.—Chapter No. 10.

Bill C-78, An Act respecting the use of the expression "Parliament Hill".—Chapter No. 11.

Bill C-208, An Act to amend the Pension Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Civilian War Pensions

and Allowances Act, the Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act and the Department of Veterans Affairs Act to provide for the annual adjustment of pensions and allowances payable thereunder.—Chapter No. 12.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Hales and Danforth for Messrs. Thomas (Moncton) and McGrath on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Jamieson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority,

including its Accounts and Financial Statements, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/242.

By Mr. Jamieson,—Report of the Seaway International Bridge Corporation, Ltd., including its Accounts and Financial Statements, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/235.

By Mr. Marchand, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on the Operation of the Regional Development Incentives Act for the period April 1 to April 30, 1972, pursuant to section 16 of the said Act, chapter R-3, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/325.

At 5.04 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until Tuesday, May 23, 1972, at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(3).

No. 57

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, MAY 23, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

On motion of Mr. Wahn, seconded by Mr. Beer, the First Report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, presented to the House on Tuesday, May 16, 1972, was concurred in.

Mr. Basford, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of the Final Report of the Tri-Level Interim Planning Committee, dated May 19, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-5/31.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Benson,—That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

And on the motion of Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. Bell, in amendment thereto,—That all the words after "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"while acknowledging certain beneficial provisions in the budget proposals, this House regrets the failure of the government to bring forth effective measures to relieve unemployment, to provide incentive for Cana-

dian investment in Canadian development or to propose personal tax relief for stimulation of the economy."

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Downey for Mr. Southam on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Broadbent for Mr. Burton on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean) for Mr. Serré on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. Nowlan for Mr. Mazankowski on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Roy (Laval), Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean), Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont), Cyr and Yanakis for Messrs. Deakon, Jerome, Pringle, Whicher and Chappell on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Saltsman for Mr. Blackburn on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

At 10.25 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 58

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Laflamme, from the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Tuesday, March 14, 1972, which reads as follows:

"Ordered,—That the allegations concerning wire-tapping and opening of mail of Members of this House be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections."

your Committee has held four sittings and heard the following witnesses:

From the Royal Canadian Mounted Police: Mr. W. L. Higgitt, Commissioner

From the Office of the Solicitor General: Mr. E. A. Côté, Deputy Solicitor General

From Bell Canada: Mr. F. D. Fahey, Director of Engineering Design.

Your Committee also heard evidence from the honourable Member for Wellington, Mr. A. D. Hales and from the honourable Member for Mackenzie, Mr. S. J. Korchinski.

Your Committee, through the Chairman, invited Mr. E. Nielsen, the honourable Member for Yukon, to appear on April 25 and 27, 1972, as it appeared to your Committee that the honourable Member for Yukon was the only other person who claimed to have any knowledge of the matters and things coming within the purview of the terms of reference mentioned above, by virtue of his remarks in the House, giving rise to the motion of the honourable Member for Fraser Valley East. Mr. Nielsen corresponded with your Committee and copies of this correspondence are herewith appended.

When the honourable Member for Yukon did not appear on the said dates, your Committee adopted the following resolution on April 27, 1972:

"That the honourable Member for Yukon be invited to appear before the Committee at any time at his convenience, within the next three weeks, in order to present evidence of the allegations made in the House with regards to tampering of mail and of telephones."

At the direction of the Chairman, a letter and an attested copy of the said resolution were sent to the honourable Member for Yukon on April 27 by the Clerk of the Committee.

In a letter addressed to the Chairman dated Friday, April 28, 1972, the honourable Member for Yukon declined to appear, and did not appear in the three week period set in the Committee's resolution.

Therefore your Committee reports as follows:

The honourable Member for Yukon was invited to appear before the Committee to give evidence and has declined to do so, for reasons stated in the said correspondence. Your Committee consider it their duty to lay this matter before the House for direction, as it appears to your Committee to be futile to proceed in the absence of the testimony of the honourable Member for Yukon.

APPENDIX

Ottawa, March 16, 1972.

Mr. Eric Nielsen, M.P.,
Room 322 W.B.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

The Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, at its meeting of Thursday, March 16, 1972, has authorized me, as Chairman, to invite you to substantiate any of the allegations you have raised in the House of Commons relating to the Committee's Order of Reference which reads as follows:

"That the allegations concerning wiretapping and opening of mail of members of this House be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections."

In order to expedite this matter, the Subcommittee would appreciate receiving all the pertinent information you may have regarding wiretapping of telephone conversations with M.P.'s and opening of mail addressed to them, before Wednesday March 22, 1972.

May I, on behalf of the Subcommittee, thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,
Ovide Laflamme
Chairman

OL/gb

Ottawa, Ontario
March 20, 1972.

Mr. Ovide Laflamme, Chairman,
Standing Committee on Privileges
and Elections,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Laflamme:

This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter of March 16th.

Mr. Nielsen is not expected back in Ottawa before Wednesday or Thursday of this week at which time your letter will be drawn to his attention immediately.

Yours truly,

(Miss) D. M. Kelly, Secretary
to Erik Nielsen, M.P.

Ottawa, Ontario
March 28, 1972.

Mr. Ovide Laflamme, Chairman,
Standing Committee on Privileges
and Elections,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Laflamme:

I have received your letter of March 16, 1972. The lack of my immediate response was due to my absence from Ottawa until last Sunday.

In your letter you invite me "to substantiate any of the allegations you have raised in the House of Commons". As Chairman of the Committee I would have expected a more accurate and impartial description of the terminology used by me in the House. Permit me to reproduce it for you. On Friday, March 10, 1972 at page 710 of *Hansard* (English) appears the following:

"POSSIBILITY OF INTERCEPTION WITHIN DEPARTMENTS OF PUBLIC SERVANTS' PERSONAL MAIL DIRECTED TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT"

"Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Is the government aware of any practice or policy in government departments whereby personal and private mail directed to Members of Parliament from government employees, using the internal mailing facilities of the department, is intercepted and examined by departmental or any other security personnel to the extent of opening envelopes, examining the contents and, in the case of unsigned correspondence, subjecting the envelopes and contents to fingerprint and other identification tests?"

"Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any such practice. I will be happy to take my hon. friend's question as notice and have it checked out to see whether there is any substance or basis to the serious matter he is raising."

"Mr. Nielsen: Will the Acting Prime Minister consult with his colleagues, particularly with the Prime Minister, for the purpose of causing an investigation to be made of this matter in order to reassure government employees that they may communicate privately with their own Member of Parliament or any Member of Parliament in confidence and without fear, as is the right of every Canadian citizen?"

"Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will be happy to raise the matter with the Prime Minister and to attempt to bring an answer back for the hon. member at a later date."

"POSSIBLE WIRETAPPING OF MEMBERS' TELEPHONES"

"Mr. Nielsen: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It seems that some hon. members find the matter humorous but I consider it to be quite serious. When the minister determines whether or not inquiries are necessary, will he specifically direct those inquiries to the possibility of long-distance calls to and from members' constituents being recorded through the long-distance facilities?"

"Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the hon. member is quite serious. If there is any possible suggestion that members' phones are being in any way interfered with, from whatever source, the matter would be quite serious indeed, and I would take whatever steps are open to us to ensure that Members of Parliament continue to have free and uninspected access to their telephones by which they are in contact with all parts of the population. I am sure that is what we all want and we will ensure that this takes place."

A careful reading of the above exchange, I am sure you will agree, does not justify your description of these matters as "allegations" raised by me, etc. The Acting Prime Minister of the day, Mr. MacEachen, more accurately described my questions as "the serious matter" being raised.

You have correctly set forth in your letter the terms of reference of the Committee. There have been allegations made, ostensibly to reassure members of the House, when the Prime Minister, on Monday, March 13, 1972 at page 745-6 of Hansard (English) made a statement on this matter. You will note that the Prime Minister in his statement refrained from describing the question asked by myself and the member for Mackenzie as "allegations".

In the Prime Minister's statement however, he makes at least four statements which may be quite properly described as allegations.

At page 745 he says "there is no such government policy" and, on the same page, —"nothing of the kind is done by the R.C.M.P. or on its behalf either in security work or in connection with criminal investigation", and, on the same page, —"there is no policy or direction in that regard", and, finally, on page 746, —"There is no recording of any kind of which I am aware, and certainly there is no policy of the kind the hon. member has suggested". These are statements that clearly fall within the committee's terms of reference and it seems to me that the committee's first duty would be to make full enquiry into these assertions and, more important, the whole matter of the "Possibility of Interception within Departments of Public Servants Personal Mail Directed To Members of Parliament" as the matter is referred to at page 710 of Hansard.

To accomplish this desirable objective it is my view, and my suggestion to you as Chairman of the Committee, that witnesses should be called before the committee to acquaint members with the policies and practices prevailing in each of the departments of the government. The committee should hear a witness or witnesses from the R.C.M.P. and from the recently established security organization in the department of the Solicitor General. The Committee should also hear evidence from witnesses knowledgeable in these fields who are members of the armed forces. Finally, the committee should hear the evidence of witnesses not in the employ of the government but who are knowledgeable in the matters referred to.

After the foregoing course of action has been taken by the Committee, then I would suggest that all Members of the House be invited to present further suggestions as to the manner in which the Committee might best complete its difficult and serious task of a full and complete enquiry and report to the House.

I personally will have further suggestions to make when the Committee has reached that stage of its proceedings.

Sincerely,

Erik Nielsen

EN: dk

Ottawa,
April 21, 1972.

Mr. Erik Nielsen, M.P.,
Room 322, West Block,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Nielsen:

Mr. Ovide Laflamme, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, has asked me to invite you to appear before the Committee to substantiate the allegations concerning wiretapping and opening of mail of Members of this House and to furnish to Members of the said Committee all information and proof in support of the said allegations.

This meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 25, 1972 at 11:00 a.m. in Room 269 West Block.

The Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure is prepared to recommend to the Committee that the meeting be held *In Camera* for the protection of your source or sources, should you request it.

If the above mentioned date or time is not suitable, would you please indicate the nearest possible date on which you would be able to appear.

An answer by Monday, April 24, 1972 would be appreciated in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

Robert D. Marleau
Clerk of the Standing Committee
on Privileges and Elections

RDM/gb

Ottawa, Ontario
April 21, 1972.

Mr. Robert D. Marleau,
Clerk of the Standing Committee
on Privileges and Elections,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Marleau:

This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter of April 21.

Mr. Nielsen is not expected back in Ottawa until Wednesday, April 26 at which time, you may be sure, I will draw your letter to his attention.

Yours truly,

(Miss) D. M. Kelly, Secretary
to Erik Nielsen, M.P.

Ottawa, Ontario
April 27, 1972.

Mr. Robert D. Marleau,
Clerk of the Standing Committee
on Privileges and Elections,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Marleau:

Mr. Nielsen has asked me to reply to your letter of April 21 with respect to the work of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Nielsen has asked me to inform you that he wrote to Mr. Ovide Laflamme, the Chairman of the Committee, on March 28 last, 31 days ago. Mr. Nielsen is still awaiting a reply from Mr. Laflamme to his letter of March 28.

Yours truly,

(Miss) D. M. Kelly, Secretary
to Erik Nielsen, M.P.

Ottawa,
April 27, 1972.

Mr. Erik Nielsen, M.P.,
Room 322 West Block,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Nielsen:

Mr. Ovide Laflamme, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, has asked me to forward to you an attested copy of the resolution adopted by the Committee on Tuesday, April 27, 1972, relating to allegations concerning wiretapping and opening of mail of Members of this House.

The Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure is prepared, as was indicated in my letter of April 21, to recommend to the Committee that the meeting be held In Camera, should you request it.

Therefore, please find herewith a copy of the said resolution.

Sincerely yours,

Robert D. Marleau
*Clerk of the Standing Committee
on Privileges and Elections*

c.c. Mr. Ovide Laflamme
RDM/gb
Encl.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Thursday, April 27, 1972.

Resolved—That the Honourable Member for the Yukon be invited to appear before the Committee at any time, at his convenience, within the next three weeks, in order to present evidence of the allegations made in the House with respect to tampering of mails and tampering of telephones.

ATTEST

Robert D. Marleau
*The Clerk of the Standing Committee
on Privileges and Elections*

Ottawa, Ontario
April 28, 1972.

Mr. Robert D. Marleau,
Clerk of the Standing Committee
on Privileges and Elections,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Marleau:

Your letter of April 27th addressed to Mr. Nielsen was received at 5:45 p.m. the same day. Mr. Nielsen at the time of receipt of your letter had not yet heard from Mr. Laflamme and is awaiting a reply to his letters of March 28th and April 26th.

Yours truly,

(Miss) D. M. Kelly, Secretary
to Erik Nielsen, M.P.

Ottawa,
April 27, 1972.

Miss D. M. Kelly,
Secretary to Mr. Erik Nielsen, M.P.,
Room 322 West Block,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Miss Kelly:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 27, 1972, and have drawn it to the attention of Mr. Ovide Laflamme, Chairman of the Committee.

Yours truly,

Robert D. Marleau
*Clerk of the Standing Committee
on Privileges and Elections*

RDM/gb

Ottawa, Ontario,
April 27, 1972.

Mr. Ovide Laflamme, Chairman,
Standing Committee on Privileges
and Elections,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Laflamme:

On April 21 a letter was written to me by your Clerk with respect to the work of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of which you are the Chairman.

At the time of its receipt I was away from Ottawa not having returned to my office until today. I have asked my secretary to reply to the letter from your Clerk.

On March 16 you wrote to me in connection with these matters and I replied to you on March 28—some 31 days ago. It may well be that you have overlooked the courtesy of a reply which I had expected to receive from you long before this late date.

In my letter of March 28 I drew your attention to the inaccuracy of the terminology used by you in your letter of March 16—an error which appears to be deliberately perpetuated by your Clerk in his letter to me of April 21 and by references by Liberal Committee Members no doubt for the benefit of the press. Let me once again say that I would have expected you as Chairman to be more accurate and impartial in your references (and those of your Clerk) to the terminology used by me in the House. These are set out verbatim in my letter to you of March 28. I also set out in my letter of March 28 to yourself a suggested course to be followed by the Committee in order to reassure Members with respect to the assertions of the Prime Minister as set forth at page 745-6 of Hansard (English) March 13, 1972. It is my understanding that the Committee has not yet seen fit to pursue the areas of enquiry suggested by me and unless such course is followed, in my view, there can be no meaningful results from the work of the Committee.

It is not my intention to submit to a strategy devised by the Liberal majority of the Committee (and the same majority on the Sub-Committee on agenda and procedure) in order to permit the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to be used for the purpose of 'witch hunting' or to pillory Government employees who desire anonymity and who have not been reassured by the so called assurance of "protection" offered to them by the Prime Minister referred to in the third paragraph of the letter of your Clerk dated April 21.

Once again may I urge the Committee to pursue the constructive course of enquiry suggested in my letter of March 28.

Sincerely,

Erik Nielsen
EN:dk
24960—22

Ottawa, April 27th, 1972.

Mr. Erik Nielsen, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Room 322 West Block,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Nielsen:

At 11:30 a.m. today I received by hand your letter dated April 27th.

You indicate that you had asked your secretary to reply to the letter sent to you on April 21 by the Clerk of the Committee, which clearly indicates that the substance of that letter of April 21 had been known to you at the latest on Monday, 24th, the last.

The Committee met on April 25 and today, to your personal knowledge, without you indicating your intention to accept the invitation made to you on April 21 to appear.

The Clerk has been ordered to send you true copy of the resolution passed unanimously by the Committee at today's meeting, inviting you again at your convenience to appear within the next three weeks, to substantiate your allegations made in the House on March 14.

We would appreciate having a precise answer from you indicating if you will or not appear before the Committee.

As to the course of action of the Committee, it's up to its members to decide. Your suggestions made in your letter of March 28 to that regard were taken into consideration by the Steering Committee and unanimously found unnecessary and premature, unless we had some elements of evidence.

Your insinuation of partiality of me as chairman should require at least to be substantiated.

Do you permit me to qualify it as an allegation?

I was rather surprised to be told by a member of the Press that he had a copy of your letter I had just received fifteen minutes earlier.

I apologize for not having personally answered your letter of March 28.

Your allegation of partiality of my part contained in it did indicate to me that any reply I would have sent, could not have been taken seriously by his recipient.

Yours truly,

Ovide Laflamme
Chairman

Ottawa, Ontario
April 28, 1972.

Ovide Laflamme, M.P., Chairman,
Standing Committee on Privileges
and Elections,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Laflamme:

Your letter of April 27th was received by me at 9:30 a.m. this date. This is the first I have heard from you

since I wrote to you on March 28th and on the morning of April 27th.

In your letter you again refer to my "allegations" made in the House on March 14th. That description of the recorded exchange between the Prime Minister and myself as set forth in Hansard for March 14th is not true and having regard to your professional experience at the Bar of your Province I can draw no other conclusion than that you are quite aware that no words used by me and as recorded in Hansard of March 14th can by the greatest stretch of the imagination be construed as "allegations". It is true that Mr. Pringle used that term in his motion and, similarly, the Prime Minister. But for you to suggest that I used that term is a deliberate distortion of the record the motivation for which I can only assume is political partisanship.

With respect to the 3rd paragraph of your letter of April 27th, you say that the Steering Committee "unanimously found it unnecessary and premature" to implement any of the suggestions made to you in my letter of March 28th. Yet in the same paragraph of your letter you state that the course of action to be followed by the Committee is up to its members. This being so I find it strange indeed that the suggestions in my letter of March 28th were not disclosed to the members of the Committee for their consideration rather than making the decision in the Steering Committee dominated by Liberal members. Then too, I am informed by our representative on the Steering Committee that your statement as to the unanimity of this decision is not true. On the contrary, I am informed that you and other members of the Steering Committee were strongly urged to adopt the suggestions set forth in my letter of March 28th.

The fact that

1. You refused me the courtesy of a reply to my letter of March 28th until yesterday, and
2. you and your Liberal colleagues on the Steering Committee refused to disclose the suggestions in my letter of March 28th for the consideration of members of the Committee, and
3. you falsely state in your letter of April 27th that the decision of the Steering Committee was unanimous

have, in part, justified me in concluding political bias on your part as Chairman of the Committee. This is not an "insinuation" or an "allegation" as you put it in your letter to me but rather a blunt statement of my opinion.

You really should not have been surprised at my action in providing to the press copies of my letters to you. Notwithstanding the fact that I had written to you over a month ago the Committee held several meetings where you had ample opportunity to disclose my suggestions of March 28th but elected not to do so. Your lack of action in this regard, naturally, resulted in a press treatment which was, to say the least, imbalanced in favour of the political purpose of the Liberals.

Your refusal to reply to my letter and your refusal to allow its contents to be exposed left me with no alternative than to do so myself. Now, at least, both points of view are exposed to the media.

In summary, I suggest to you that I am fully justified in my conclusion that the motion of Mr. Pringle and the statements and actions of Liberal members of the Committee (and the Steering Committee) both in Committee and to the media, have but one objective—a witch hunt or, at the very least, to cause personal political embarrassment to me. I will have no part of subverting the use of Standing Committees to such purposes.

The Committee has a useful and legitimate task to perform and it can do so by following the suggestions I put to you in my letter of March 28th. Accordingly, until such time as you and your Liberal colleagues abandon political partisanship in favour of a meaningful enquiry by the Committee, I have no intention of contributing in any way to its activities.

Sincerely,

Erik Nielsen
EN:dk

Mr. Mahoney, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Report of the Auditor General to the House of Commons for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/64.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following five Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 158—*Mr. Harding*

1. What amount was spent by each federal department and agency, including the Prime Minister's office, on travelling expenses of their staffs in each of the past three fiscal years?

2. What amount was spent by each on entertainment in each of the past three fiscal years?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/158.

No. 160—*Mr. Harding*

1. (a) How many pieces of the following office equipment were purchased by each federal department and agency in each of the past three fiscal years and what were the costs for each category (i) typewriters (ii) dictaphones (iii) tape recorders (iv) adding machines (v) calculating machines (b) what was the total stock of this equipment in each federal department and agency for each of the five categories as of March 31, 1971?

2. What was the total cost of purchases and installation of office furnishings for (a) furniture (b) carpets and carpeting (c) draperies and blinds (d) others, in each federal department and agency in each of the past three fiscal years?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/160.

No. 330—*Mr. Stewart* (Okanagan-Kootenay)

1. What is the area in square miles and the population of (a) Prince Edward Island (b) Vancouver Island (c) the federal constituency of Okanagan-Kootenay?

2. What were the investment expenditures of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, over the past ten years, for national parks (a) in total (b) for each park?

3. What is the amount of the development and maintenance expenditures made by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for national parks over the past five years (a) in total (b) for each park?

4. Do the above amounts include departmental expenditures for the construction of principal highways traversing national parks and, if not, what is this cost over the past five years?

5. Will departmental hearings on the provisional master plans for Glacier and Mount Revelstoke National Parks be held and, if so (a) when (b) in what place?

6. What is the area in square miles of each of Canada's national parks?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/330.

No. 337—*Mr. Stewart* (Okanagan-Kootenay)

1. To the government's knowledge, what has been the amount of union dues and assessments paid by Canadian workers to international unions over the past five years?

2. What Canadian trade unions are affiliated with and mainly controlled by American parents?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/337.

No. 372—*Mr. Laprise*

1. What are the names and addresses of the census commissioners and representatives hired by the government in the constituency of Abitibi for the 1971 Census?

2. What salary was paid to each?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/372.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Resolved,—That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence and other documents concerning the recent sale of land owned by the City of Regina at the Regina Airport to the Department of Transport.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 18.—Mr. Burton.*)

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 27, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Gaston G. Chamailard, undertaken for the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, regarding a Canada-wide survey of public information, educational activities relating to water resources and

water pollution, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the 1st Session of this Parliament,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 28, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Operation Research Industries Limited undertaken for the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources regarding a quantitative assessment of the Policy and Planning Branch as mentioned in answer to Question Number 2,452 of the 1st Session of this Parliament,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to "Motions".

Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copy of a statement, dated May 24, 1972, with reference to Rhodesia.—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/7.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Benson,—That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

And on the motion of Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. Bell, in amendment thereto,—That all the words after "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"while acknowledging certain beneficial provisions in the budget proposals, this House regrets the failure of the government to bring forth effective measures to relieve unemployment, to provide incentive for Canadian investment in Canadian development or to propose personal tax relief for stimulation of the economy."

And debate continuing;

At 5.45 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker interrupted the debate pursuant to Standing Order 60(7) and the question being put on the said proposed amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 20)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Flemming,	Lambert	McCleave,	Rodrigue,
Alexander,	Fortin,	(Edmonton West),	McGrath,	Rondeau,
Alkenbrack,	Gilbert,	Laprise,	McKinley,	Rose,
Asselin,	Gleave,	La Salle,	Marshall,	Rowland,
Baldwin,	Godin,	Latulippe,	Mather,	Ryan,
Barnett,	Grills,	Lewis,	Mazankowski,	Rynard,
Bell,	Gundlock,	Lundrigan,	Moore,	Skoberg,
Bigg,	Hales,	MacDonald	Muir,	Stewart
Blackburn,	Hees,	(Egmont),	Murta,	(Marquette),
Brewin,	Horner,	MacInnis (Cape	Nielsen,	Tétrault,
Broadbent,	Howard (Skeena),	Breton-East	Noble,	Thompson
Burton,	Howe,	Richmond),	Nystrom,	(Red Deer),
Coates,	Knight,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Orlikow,	Valade,
Dinsdale,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacKay,	Paproski,	Wooliams,
Dionne,	North Centre),	MacLean,	Peters,	Yewchuk—75.
Downey,	Lambert	Macquarrie,	Ricard,	
Fairweather,	(Bellechasse),	MacRae,	Rock,	

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Dubé,	Lachance,	Marceau,	Roy (Laval),
Andras,	Dupras,	Laflamme,	Marchand	Serré,
Badanai,	Duquet,	Laing	(Langelier),	Sharp,
Barrett,	Éthier,	(Vancouver South),	Marchand	Smerchanski,
Béchar, d,	Faulkner,	Lajoie,	(Kamloops-	Smith
Beer,	Forest,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Cariboo),	(Saint-Jean),
Blair,	Forget,	Humboldt),	Morison,	Stafford,
Blouin,	Foster,	Langlois,	Munro,	Stanbury,
Borrie,	Francis,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Murphy,	Stewart
Boulanger,	Gendron,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Noël,	(Cochrane),
Breau,	Gervais,	Lefebvre,	O'Connell,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Buchanan,	Gibson,	Legault,	Olson,	Kootenay),
Caccia,	Gillespie,	Lessard	Orange,	Sullivan,
Cafik,	Gray,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Osler,	Thomas
Chappell,	Greene,	L'Heureux,	Otto,	(Maisonneuve-
Chrétien,	Groos,	Lind,	Ouellet,	Rosemont),
Clermont,	Guay (St. Boniface),	Loiselle,	Pelletier,	Trudeau,
Cobbe,	Guay (Lévis),	Macdonald	Penner,	Trudel,
Corriveau,	Guilbault,	(Rosedale),	Pepin,	Turner
Côté (Richelieu),	Hogarth,	MacEachen,	Perrault,	(London East),
Cyr,	Hopkins,	Mackasey,	Prud'homme,	Walker,
Danson,	Hymmen,	McBride,	Richardson,	Watson,
Davis,	Jamieson,	McNulty,	Robinson,	Whelan,
Deachman,	Jerome,	Mahoney,	Rochon,	Whiting,
Deakon,	Kaplan,	Major,	Roy (Timmins),	Yanakis—113.
De Bané,				

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4) (b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) and Roy (Laval) for Messrs. Gilbert and Weatherhead on the

Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Burton for Mr. Nystrom on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. McCleave for Mr. Carter on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Messrs. Otto and Smith (Saint-Jean) for Messrs. Roy (Laval) and Crossman on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Smerchanski for Mr. Foster on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Goyer, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copy of Contracts entered into between the Government of Canada and the Town of Fort Saskatchewan, in the Province of Alberta, pursuant to section 20(3) of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, chapter R-9, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/266A.

At 6.10 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 59

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Beer, from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following Votes listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25 relating to the Department of Agriculture;

Vote 30 relating to the Canadian Dairy Commission;

Votes 35 and 40 relating to the Canadian Livestock Feed Board;

Vote 45 relating to the Farm Credit Corporation.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 15, both inclusive*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 21 to the Journals).

Mr. Andras, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Report entitled "The War Claims Commission, World War II, 1970". (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-4/153.

The Order being read for resuming debate on the motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-211, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections;

Mr. Yewchuk, seconded by Mr. Alexander, moved,—That the debate be now adjourned.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 21)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Flemming,	MacInnis (Cape	McKinley,	Rock,
Alexander,	Grills,	Breton-East	Marshall,	Ryan,
Alkenbrack,	Gundlock,	Richmond),	Mazankowski,	Rynard,
Baldwin,	Hees,	MacKay,	Monteith,	Scott,
Bell,	Horner,	MacLean,	Muir,	Stewart
Bigg,	Howe,	Macquarrie,	Murta,	(Marquette),
Coates,	Lambert	MacRae,	Nesbitt,	Thompson
Crouse,	(Edmonton West),	McCleave,	Noble,	(Red Deer),
Dinsdale,	Lundrigan,	McGrath,	Paproski.	Valade,
Fairweather,	MacDonald	McIntosh,	Ricard,	Yewchuk—45.
	(Egmont),			

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Côté (Longueuil),	Howard (Okanagan	Macdonald	Roberts,
Andras,	Cyr,	Boundary),	(Rosedale),	Robinson,
Badanai,	Davis,	Howard (Skeena),	MacEachen,	Rochon,
Barnett,	Deachman,	Jamieson,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Rose,
Barrett,	Deakon,	Kaplan,	Mackasey,	Rowland,
Basford,	De Bané,	Knight,	McBride,	Roy (Timmins),
Béchar, d,	Drury,	Knowles (Winnipeg	McNulty,	Roy (Laval),
Beer,	Dubé,	North Centre),	Marceau,	Saltsman,
Blackburn,	Dupras,	Lachance,	Mather,	Serré,
Blair,	Faulkner,	Laing	Munro,	Smith
Blouin,	Forest,	(Vancouver South),	Murphy,	(Saint-Jean),
Borrie,	Forget,	Lajoie,	Noël,	Stafford,
Boulanger,	Francis,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Nystrom,	Stanbury,
Breau,	Gendron,	Humboldt),	O'Connell,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Brewin,	Gibson,	Langlois,	Olson,	Kootenay),
Broadbent,	Gilbert,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Osler,	Sullivan,
Buchanan,	Gillespie,	Lefebvre,	Otto,	Trudeau,
Caccia,	Gleave,	Legault,	Ouellet,	Trudel,
Cafik,	Groos,	Lessard (LaSalle),	Pelletier,	Turner
Chappell,	Guay (St. Boniface),	Lessard	Penner,	(London East),
Clermont,	Guay (Lévis),	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Pepin,	Walker,
Cobbe,	Guilbault,	Lewis,	Perrault,	Watson,
Comtois,	Hellyer,	L'Heureux,	Peters,	Weatherhead,
Corriveau,	Hopkins,	Loiselle,	Prud'homme,	Whelan,
Côté (Richelieu),			Richardson,	Whiting—114.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-211, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m. Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

[Notices of Motions (Papers)]

By unanimous consent, items numbered 2, 3 and 6 were allowed to stand.

Mr. Hellyer, seconded by Mr. Bell, moved,—That an Order of the House do issue for copies of any report or reports prepared by or for the government recommending that Atomic Energy of Canada Limited assume responsibility for the reconstruction and operation of the Deuterium of Canada Limited heavy water production plant at Glace Bay, N.S.—(Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 36).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-211, An Act to

amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mr. Barnett, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-211 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should give immediate consideration to the presenting of a bill that will provide effective control over election expenses, by establishing reasonable limitations on the amounts parties as well as candidates may spend, and by providing for the full disclosure of contributions to political candidates and parties both at the time of and between election campaigns.

RULING BY MR. ACTING SPEAKER

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Laniel): Before I examine the procedural acceptability of the amendment perhaps I ought to read the amendment to the House so that it will be a part of our proceedings. "That Bill C-211 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should give immediate consideration to the presenting of a bill that will provide effective control over election expenses, by establishing reasonable limitations on the amounts parties as well as candidates may spend, and by providing for the full disclosure of contributions to political candidates and parties both at the time of and between election campaigns."

As it has already been stated many times from the Chair, reasoned amendments on second reading are among the most difficult of our parliamentary proceedings. In the past few years honourable Members have sought to make greater use of such amendments and indeed, have sought to go beyond the recognized forms—the six months hoist, or a reasoned amendment to second reading. I wish to thank honourable Members who have contributed to the procedural debate. Points made by both participants are of interest and value. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) expressed the view that the amendment we are considering put forward proposals which might be made in committee. The honourable Member referred to citation 389 of Beauchesne to which I may later return. The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) referred to the limitations of the Governor General's recommendation suggesting that the Chair, by previous decisions, had limited the possibility of going beyond the recommendation, or the possibility of altering any of the proposals which were covered by the recommendation.

The honourable Member referred to citation 382 dealing with the subject of reasoned amendments—a citation of which was used last Friday, I believe—under the terms of which an honourable Member can put forward reasons for not agreeing to second reading of a bill.

That having been said, there are a few questions the Chair must ask in his desire to proceed in accordance with the practices of this House. The Chair has to decide on the procedural acceptability of the amendment. I find myself wondering at this point whether the amendment before us does, in fact, really oppose the principle of the bill. I might be permitted to refer to citation 382 and read it to the House: "It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record his special reason for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill to move, as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information in relation to the Bill by Committees or Commissioners—".

I have great doubts about this amendment and its effect on the bill. I am tempted to conclude that the amendment is not really opposing the principle of the bill. Although the honourable Member, in his speech, said he could not accept the measure because it did not contain certain provisions, his amendment does not oppose the principle; the subject-matter within the proposal in front of us in this bill. I am wondering if what appear to be the reasons given by the honourable Member in his amendment are not proposals which might well be the substance of another bill. On the other hand, the President of the Privy Council has suggested that the proposals contained in the amendment could be put forward at the committee stage. The honourable Member referred to citation 389 of Beauchesne where it is stated: "A motion opposing second reading of the bill must not anticipate amendments which could be moved in committee."

In that regard, the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre made his point as to the recommendation of His Excellency, which, in his mind, set a limitation on the capability of the committee, or the House at a later stage, of accepting such amendments.

In the opinion of the Chair, after looking at the recommendation attached to the present bill, it is in general terms and would appear to be wide enough to permit honourable Members to include the changes suggested in the amendment moved by the honourable Member. Honourable Members cannot, of course, expand the measure beyond the limits of the recommendation of His Excellency but I do not see any limit on the possibility of providing for a restriction. The arguments of the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, based, probably, on previous decisions, were to my mind more particularly concerned with moneys involving expenditure by the Treasury. The precedents are quite clear on that point. When we are speaking of expenditure or appropriation of money, this limitation, of course, applies. But when it comes to the possibility of proposing amendments to a bill, it is my impression that the recommendation we have before us is wide enough to enable the committee to accept such amendments, although, of

course, the Chair is not prejudging what could be done in committee.

In conclusion, basing myself on the point that I stressed at the beginning that the amendment should clearly oppose the principle of the bill, and that it might be anticipating at the same time amendments that could be made at the committee stage, I hold that the amendment cannot be accepted at this time.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-211, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.01 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Buchanan, Stafford, Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean), Alkenbrack, Scott and Mazankowski for Messrs. Crossman, Sulatycky, Yanakis, Korchinski, Nowlan and Danforth on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Faulkner and MacDonald (Egmont) for Messrs. Forest and Nowlan on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Messrs. Gilbert, Rose and McKinley for Messrs. Skoberg, Saltsman and Horner on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Messrs. Corriveau, Robinson, Lajoie and McCleave for Messrs. Portelance, Badanai, Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont) and Danforth on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Gundlock for Mr. Asselin on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Roberts for Mr. Crossman on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Return to an Address, dated May 24, 1972, to His Excellency the Governor General, for a copy of all correspondence and other documents concerning the recent sale of land owned by the City of Regina at the Regina Airport to the Department of Transport. (*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 18*).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/18.

By Mr. Marchand, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Supplementary Report on Revised accepted incentive grant offers under the Regional Development Incentives Act and "Special Areas" Legislation, for the period from the inception of Regional Development Incentives Act to April 30, 1972, pursuant to section 16 of the said Act, chapter R-3, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/325A.

At 10.25 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 60

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Lessard (LaSalle), from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, presented the Third Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following Votes listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Votes 1 and 5 relating to the Department of Communications;

Vote L10 relating to the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation;

Votes 1, 5, 10, L15, 20, 25, 30, L35, 40, 45, 50, 55 and 60 relating to the Department of Transport;

Vote 65 relating to the Atlantic Pilotage Authority;

Vote 70 relating to the Canadian National Railways;

Votes 75 and 80 relating to the Canadian Transport Commission;

Vote 85 relating to the Great Lakes Pilotage Authority;

Vote 90 relating to the Laurentian Pilotage Authority;

Votes 95, 100 and L105 relating to the National Harbours Board;

Vote L110 relating to Northern Transportation Company Limited;

Vote 115 relating to the Pacific Pilotage Authority; and

Votes 120, L125 and 130 relating to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 2 to 9 inclusive*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 22 to the Journals*).

By unanimous consent, the motion for concurrence in the First Report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, presented to the House on Thursday, March 16, 1972, was withdrawn.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Baldwin, seconded by Mr. Hees, moved,—This House, noting the continuing erosion of Parliament's control over government spending of public monies due to government evasion of constitutional and legal safeguards as noted in the 1970-71 Report of the Auditor General, and due to imperfect procedural structure, re-affirms the fundamental principle of the Canadian constitution that Parliament must control expenditures of public monies.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the motion expired.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Buchanan, Whelan, Whicher, Danforth, Skoberg and Saltsman for Messrs. Corriveau, Lajoie, Robinson, McCleave, Gilbert and Rose on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

At 5.00 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until Monday at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 61

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, MAY 29, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

The following Notice of Motion having been called was transferred to Government Orders for consideration at the next sitting of the House pursuant to Standing Order 21(2):

That the Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1971 and the Auditor General's Report thereon be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.
—*The President of the Privy Council.*

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following Question was made an Order of the House for a Return:

No. 291—*Mr. Robinson*

1. What is the rate of unemployment on Indian reservations generally?
2. What programmes are in effect to deal with unemployed Indians?
3. To what extent have the federal and provincial governments coordinated their efforts to reduce unemployment among Indians?
4. Does Canada Manpower provide services on Indian reservations?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/291.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Return to the foregoing Order.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons;

Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. Basford, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Fairweather, seconded by Mr. McCleave, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-201 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should consider introducing more comprehensive and more constructive measures that will increase Canadian participation in and control of the Canadian economy.

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) has proposed what he described as a reasoned amendment. He and other Members may be able to convince me otherwise, but with great respect I think it is not a reasoned amendment as we know it within the rules and precedents of the House. I might indicate to the honourable Member that one of the requirements of a reasoned amendment is that it oppose the principle of the bill. The honourable Member has indicated that he does not oppose the principle, but suggests that the government should introduce far more comprehensive and, as he described it, more constructive measures. I will hear argument if the honourable Member would like to present it.

— — — — —

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Fundy-Royal in proposing a reasoned amendment has referred to the rule changes. If the honourable Member can give me authority or precedent to indicate that the rules in respect of a reasoned amendment have been changed as a result of the rule changes I will be guided by that. However, it is my opinion that consideration as to the procedural acceptability of reasoned amendments have not been changed by the rule changes. Many honourable Members who are learned in procedural matters have argued that this is the case, but because honourable Members argue that, to be the case, does not make it so. With respect, I feel there is no authority vested in the Chair to alter the established principles outlined by Beauchesne, May and other authorities which have guided us for some time. In my respectful opinion the rule changes have not changed the considerations I must apply as to whether or not the Chair should accept a reasoned amendment. For that reason and the reasons I mentioned earlier I regretfully must come to the conclusion that this is not a reasoned amendment and, therefore, it cannot be put to the Chamber.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. Basford,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Notices of Motions)

Mr. McCleave, seconded by Mr. MacLean, moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of declaring as rapidly as feasible a 90-10 formula of cost-sharing with the Atlantic

Provinces, of the highways program formerly carried on with those provinces by the Atlantic Development Board, and of joining with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in the Fundy Trail project, and of joining with Nova Scotia in building a crossing across the Shubenacadie River.—(Notice of Motion No. 9).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. Basford,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Nowlan for Mr. MacDonald (Egmont) on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Messrs. Major, Roy (Laval), Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean), Langlois, Rock and Peddle for Messrs. LeBlanc (Rimouski), Robinson, Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont), Marceau, MacDonald (Egmont) and Ryan on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Chrétien, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Capital Budget of the National Battlefields Commission for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, pursuant to section 70(2) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970, (English and

French), together with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1972-998, dated May 11, 1972, approving same.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/194A.

By Mr. Chrétien,—Report of the Number and Amount of Loans to Indians made under section 70(1) of the Indian Act for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 70(6) of the said Act, chapter I-6,

R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/161.

At 10.16 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 62

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, MAY 30, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Kaplan, from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, presented the Third Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following Votes, listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Votes 1, 5 and 10 relating to the Department of Finance;

Vote 20 relating to the Department of Insurance;

Vote 25 relating to the Tariff Board;

Votes 1, 5, 10, L15, 20, 30 and L35 relating to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce;

Vote 40 relating to the Standards Council of Canada;

Vote 45 relating to Statistics Canada;

Vote 20 relating to the Economic Council of Canada;

Votes 1 and 5 relating to the Department of National Revenue.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues* Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 23 to the Journals).

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. Basford,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

By unanimous consent, Order numbered one was allowed to stand.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and

Legal Affairs of Bill C-19, An Act respecting employment with the Government of Canada not covered by the Public Service Employment Act;

Mr. Orlikow, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. Basford,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Skoreyko, Gundlock, Grills, Cadieu and Schumacher for Messrs. Murta, McKinley, Moore, Downey and Mazankowski on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay) and Pringle for Messrs. Cafik and Whicher on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Orlikow for Mr. Broadbent on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Clermont and Breau for Messrs. Blouin and Cullen on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Nystrom for Mr. Broadbent on the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont) for Mr. Nesbitt on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Messrs. Ryan and Peddle for Messrs. MacDonald (Egmont) and Paproski on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Messrs. Forget and La Salle for Messrs. McNulty and Turner (London East) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Stewart (Cochrane), Guilbault, De Bané and Roy (Timmins) for Messrs. Portelance, Forget, Lachance and Robinson on the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

At 10.25 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 63

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Portelance, from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, presented the Third Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following votes listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Votes 15 and 20 relating to the Department of Manpower and Immigration;

Vote 5 relating to the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 2, 3 and 18*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 24 to the Journals*).

Mr. Trudeau, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—(1) Copies of Revised Constitution

of the Order of Canada together with Letters Patent and Order in Council P.C. 1972-809, dated May 1, 1972, approving same.—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/8.

(2) Copies of Constitution of the Order of Military Merit together with Letters Patent and Order in Council P.C. 1972-810, dated May 1, 1972, approving same.—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/8A.

(3) Copies of Regulations pertaining to three decorations for bravery together with Letters Patent and Order in Council P.C. 1972-811, dated May 1, 1972, approving same.—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/8B. (English and French).

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following three Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 86—Mr. Coates

1. How many Royal Commissions or other bodies of enquiry have been instituted by the federal government since June 25, 1968?

2. In each instance (a) what was the date of the establishment of the commission (b) what were the names of the persons appointed in each instance (c) has the commission completed its work and, if not, on what

date is its work to be completed (d) how much has each of the persons appointed received in salary and expenses?

3. In each instance, were federal government facilities and employees used for any part of the work of the commissions and, if so, how were they used?

4. Has each commission used the printing facilities of the federal government to carry out its responsibilities in that regard and, if not (a) which commissions did not use such facilities for all of their work (b) in each instance, how was a determination made as to what private printing firms should be used for such work?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/86.

No. 279—*Mr. Robinson*

In each year since the United Nations was created (a) how much has Canada contributed as its designated share toward the general maintenance of the United Nations (b) how many special funds of the United Nations has Canada contributed to (c) what has been the amount of each such contribution (d) for what purpose was each contribution made?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/279.

No. 503—*Mr. Korchinski*

1. In each province in the past four years, how many post offices were built by the Department of Public Works?

2. What was the location and what were the revenues in each case?

3. In each province, how many post offices were there that had revenues greater than the revenues at offices where construction was undertaken?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/503.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 4, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for Assessment Reports carried out under the auspices of the Canadian Council on Animal Care (a) in Canadian universities for the fiscal year 1970-71 (b) in federal government departments for the use of animals for experimental purposes, that is, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of National Health and Welfare, the National Research Council and the Defence Research Board, such reports covering the fiscal year 1969-70 (c) in Canadian pharmaceutical houses for the fiscal year 1969-70,

having been called was, at the request of the honourable Member for Vancouver Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 42, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the agreement between Panarctic Oils Ltd. and a consortium of United States companies consisting of Tenneco Oils and Minerals Ltd., Columbia Gas Systems Inc., Texas Eastern Transmission Co., and Northern Natural Gas Co. with reference to the right of first refusal on Arctic gas supplies,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Ordered,—That there be laid before this House copies of the 8 reports resulting from Summer 71 Information Canada Communications Research Project.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 61—Mr. Rowland*).

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. Basford,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Murta for Mr. Skoreyko on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Weatherhead, Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont) and Leblanc (Laurier) for Messrs. Smith (Saint-Jean), Allmand and Rochon on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Marceau for Mr. Langlois on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Harding for Mr. Brewin on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Return to an Order of the House, dated May 31, 1972, for copies of the 8 reports resulting from Sum-

mer 71 Information Canada Communications Research Project.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 61*).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/61.

By Mr. Pelletier, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Public Service Commission of Canada for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to the Public Service Employment Act, section 45, chapter P-32, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/216.

By Mr. Pelletier,—Report on Delegation of Staffing Authority during the period January 1, 1971 to December 31, 1971, pursuant to the Public Service Employment Act, section 45, chapter P-32, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/218.

By Mr. Pelletier,—Report on Positions or Persons or Classes of Positions or Persons Excluded in Whole or in Part from the Operation of the Public Service Employment Act, January 1, 1971 to December 31, 1971, pursuant to the Public Service Employment Act, section 45, chap-

ter P-32, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/217.

By Mr. Stanbury, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Annual Report of Telesat Canada 1971, pursuant to section 37 of the Telesat Canada Act, chapter T-4, R.S.C., 1970 (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/305.

By Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on the Operations of the Exchange Fund Account for the year ended December 31, 1971, together with the Financial Statement for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 17 of the Currency and Exchange Act, chapter C-39, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/133.

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 64

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface), from the Standing Committee on Regional Development, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, February 28, 1972, your Committee has considered the following votes listed in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Votes 1, 5, 10, L15, L20, L25 and L30 relating to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion; and

Votes 35, 40 and 45 relating to the Cape Breton Development Corporation.

Your Committee commends them to the House.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 14*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 25 to the Journals).

Pursuant to Standing Order 43, on motion of Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mr. Douglas, it was ordered,—That the Annual Report of

the Public Service Commission of Canada for 1971, Tabled in the House of Commons yesterday by the Secretary of State, be referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Trudeau, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Directive respecting the Protocol for wearing the Insignia of Canadian Orders and Canadian Decorations together with Order in Council P.C. 1972-1206, dated June 1, 1972, approving same. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/8C.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That speeches on the motion under the order Business of Supply be limited to fifteen minutes with the exception of the mover, the principal speaker on behalf of the government who shall be limited to thirty minutes and the principal speakers of the other opposition parties who shall be limited to twenty minutes.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mrs. MacInnis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That,

in the opinion of this House, the Government has failed to cope with the problem of steadily rising food prices, which seriously affect Canadian living standards, or with the fact that supermarket profits have increased simultaneously at an unprecedented rate, and because these matters are of nation-wide concern they should be referred immediately to a Special Committee of this House for investigation and report by June 26, 1972.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. McGrath, seconded by Mr. Dinsdale, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after “standards” and substituting the following:

“and because the Prices and Incomes Commission has failed to inform the general public on how food price stability may best be achieved, should forthwith amend the terms of reference of the Commission to require it to investigate and report thereon before September 1st, 1972.”.

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. John's East has proposed an amendment to the motion moved by the honourable Member for Vancouver Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis). I have some reservations concerning the procedural acceptability of the amendment. I will hear honourable Members if they wish to assist the Chair. I would invite them to direct their remarks particularly to what seems to me to be the situation. If the amendment of the honourable Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) were accepted it would seem we would in effect have a new question and would then be dealing with a reference to the Prices and Incomes Commission whereas the motion of the honourable Member for Vancouver Kingsway refers to a reference to a special committee of the House. This concerns me from a procedural standpoint. I think it is a new question. However, I would like to hear honourable Members if they wish to assist the Chair.

— — — — —

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should like to thank honourable Members who assisted the Chair on the procedural aspect. Initially, I indicated my doubts about whether the amendment could be accepted procedurally and I have to confirm my original thoughts.

First of all, I want to deal briefly with the point made by the honourable Member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) whose views were clarified and narrowed by the honourable Member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale). Certainly there are times and circumstances when a motion on an opposition day is amendable. Indeed the Chair has allowed amendments if not in this session in the last session of this Parliament. On opposition days, however, we must look very carefully at amendments and the circumstances because if they change the direction or the impact or the thrust of the motion, they are not acceptable. I think it would be unfair to opposition

parties if such amendments were acceptable. This is of course in the interests of all opposition parties and the interests of fairness.

I think this amendment does change the substance of the motion on two points. In her motion the honourable Member for Vancouver Kingsway has requested reference to a special committee of the House. The honourable Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), who proposed the amendment, would have the reference made to the Prices and Incomes Commission. The honourable Member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and the honourable Member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) argued fairly and with some force that the honourable Member who moved the motion has a right to put her question before the House and have the matter determined by the forum or tribunal that she chooses. The honourable Member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has argued that it is really a case of one tribunal compared to another as one would compare one court to another but with respect I cannot agree that such is the case. I think we are talking about very different tribunals and that the honourable Member for Vancouver Kingsway has the right to choose the one she would like to suggest to the Chamber for its consideration.

Honourable Members have referred to the fact that if the amendment was accepted the reference to the question of profits of supermarkets would be removed from the consideration of the House. I think that is important and is a substantive part of the motion of the honourable Member for Vancouver Kingsway. It seems to me that we would be changing it substantially and much more than we are entitled to do if the amendment was allowed. The honourable Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) referred to citation 203 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition and I would like to refer to section (3) of that, which says: “An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved.”

Some honourable Members have argued that the motion and the amendment deal with the question of food prices, but where I feel the amendment is irrelevant and why I cannot accept it is because of the change of tribunals which I have referred to and the removal of the question of supermarket profits both of which would be substantive changes.

— — — — —

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mrs. MacInnis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That, in the opinion of this House, the Government has failed to cope with the problem of steadily rising food prices, which seriously affect Canadian living standards, or with the fact that supermarket profits have increased simultaneously at an unprecedented rate, and because these matters are of nation-wide concern they should be referred immediately to a Special Committee of this House for investigation and report by June 26, 1972.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Woolliams, seconded by Mr. McCutcheon, moved in amendment thereto,—That the motion be amended by adding after the word “rate”, the following words:

“and/or with the fact that transportation costs have increased substantially and at an uncontrolled, unprecedented rate,”.

And debate arising thereon, at 9.45 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker interrupted the debate pursuant to Standing Order 58(9);

And the question being put on the said proposed amendment, it was negated on the following division:

(Division No. 22)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alkenbrack,
Barnett,
Beaudoin,
Bell,
Benjamin,
Broadbent,
Burton,
Cadieu,
Caouette,
Crouse,
Danforth,
Dionne,
Douglas,
Fairweather,

Flemming,
Forrestall,
Gilbert,
Gleave,
Grills,
Harding,
Horner,
Howard (Skeena),
Knight,
Knowles (Winnipeg
North Centre),
Knowles (Norfolk-
Haldimand),

Lambert
(Bellechasse),
Lambert
(Edmonton West),
Lewis,
Lundrigan,
MacInnis (Cape
Breton-East
Richmond),
MacInnis (Mrs.),
MacKay,
Macquarrie,
McCleave,

McCutcheon,
McGrath,
Marshall,
Mather,
Matte,
Mazankowski,
Nystrom,
Orlikow,
Peddle,
Peters,
Rodrigue,
Rondeau,
Rose,

Rowland,
Ryan,
Schumacher,
Stanfield,
Thomas
(Moncton),
Thompson
(Red Deer),
Thomson
(Battleford-
Kindersley),
Woolliams,
Yewchuk—56.

NAYS

Messrs.

Badanai,
Barrett,
Basford,
Béchar, d,
Benson,
Blair,
Borrie,
Boulanger,
Breau,
Buchanan,
Caccia,
Cafik,
Chappell,
Clermont,
Cobbe,
Comtois,
Corbin,
Corriveau,
Cullen,
Cyr,
Danson,
Davis,

Deachman,
De Bané,
Drury,
Dubé,
Dupras,
Éthier,
Forget,
Francis,
Gendron,
Gibson,
Gillespie,
Goode,
Goyer,
Gray,
Groos,
Guay (St. Boniface),
Guilbault,
Haidasz,
Hopkins,
Howard (Okanagan
Boundary),
Hymmen,

Isabelle,
Jerome,
Kaplan,
Lachance,
Laing
(Vancouver South),
Lajoie,
Lang (Saskatoon-
Humboldt),
Langlois,
Laniel,
Leblanc (Laurier),
Lefebvre,
Legault,
Lessard (LaSalle),
L'Heureux,
Macdonald
(Rosedale),
MacEachen,
MacGuigan,
Mackasey,
McBride,

Mahoney,
Marceau,
Marchand
(Langelier),
Marchand
(Kamloops-
Cariboo),
Munro,
Olson,
Otto,
Ouellet,
Pelletier,
Penner,
Pepin,
Portelance,
Pringle,
Reid,
Richardson,
Roberts,
Robinson,
Rochon,
Roy (Laval),

Serré,
Smith
(Northumberland-
Miramichi),
Smith (Saint-Jean),
Stafford,
Stanbury,
Stewart (Okanagan-
Kootenay),
Thomas
(Maisonneuve-
Rosemont),
Trudeau,
Trudel,
Turner (Ottawa-
Carleton),
Wahn,
Walker,
Watson,
Weatherhead,
Whelan,
Whiting—97.

And the question being put on the main motion, it was negated on the following division:

(Division No. 23)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alkenbrack,
Barnett,
Bell,
Benjamin,

Broadbent,
Burton,
Cadieu,
Crouse,

Danforth,
Douglas,
Fairweather,
Flemming,

Forrestall,
Gilbert,
Gleave,
Grills,

Harding,
Horner,
Howard (Skeena),
Knight,

Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),	MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond),	Marshall, Mather, Matte,	Rose, Rowland, Ryan,	Thompson (Red Deer),
Knowles (Norfolk- Haldimand),	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Mazankowski,	Schumacher,	Thomson (Battleford- Kindersley),
Lambert (Edmonton West),	MacKay,	Nystrom,	Stanfield,	Woolliams,
Lewis,	Macquarrie,	Orlikow,	Thomas (Moncton),	Yewchuk—49.
Lundrigan,	McCleave,	Peddle,		
	McGrath,	Peters,		

NAYS

Messrs.

Andras,	Danson,	Isabelle,	Marceau,	Smith
Badanai,	Davis,	Jerome,	Marchand	(Northumberland- Miramichi),
Barrett,	Deachman,	Kaplan,	(Langelier),	Smith
Basford,	De Bané,	Lachance,	Marchand	(Saint-Jean),
Beaudoin,	Drury,	Laing	(Kamloops- Cariboo),	Stafford,
Béchar, d,	Dubé,	(Vancouver South),	Munro,	Stanbury,
Benson,	Dupras,	Lajoie,	Olson,	Stewart (Okanagan- Kootenay),
Blair,	Éthier,	Lang (Saskatoon- Humboldt),	Otto,	Thomas
Borrie,	Forget,	Langlois,	Ouellet,	(Maisonneuve- Rosemont),
Boulanger,	Francis,	Laniel,	Pelletier,	Trudeau,
Breau,	Gendron,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Penner,	Trudel,
Buchanan,	Gibson,	Lefebvre,	Pepin,	Turner (Ottawa- Carleton),
Caccia,	Gillespie,	Legault,	Portelance,	Wahn,
Cafik,	Goode,	Lessard (LaSalle),	Pringle,	Walker,
Caouette,	Goyer,	L'Heureux,	Reid,	Watson,
Chappell,	Groos,	Macdonald	Richardson,	Weatherhead,
Clermont,	Guay (St. Boniface),	(Rosedale),	Roberts,	Whelan,
Cobbe,	Guilbault,	MacEachen,	Robinson,	Whiting—99.
Comtois,	Haidasz,	MacGuigan,	Rochon,	
Corbin,	Hopkins,	Mackasey,	Roy (Laval),	
Corriveau,	Howard (Okanagan Boundary),	McBride,	Serré,	
Cullen,	Hymmen,	Mahoney,		
Cyr,				

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Robinson for Mr. Hymmen on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Messrs. Breau and Laflamme for Messrs. Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean) and Major on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Messrs. Mazankowski and Danforth for Messrs. Grills and Scott on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Broadbent for Mr. Orlikow on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Corriveau for Mr. Leblanc (Laurier) on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface) for Mr. Loiselle on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Roy (Laval) and Laflamme for Messrs. Perreault and La Salle on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Trudeau, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Summary of Orders in Council passed during the month of January, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/351.

At 10.19 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 65

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, JUNE 2, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Portelance, from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, presented the Fourth Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Friday, May 5, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-195, An Act to amend the Adult Occupational Training Act, and has agreed to report it without amendment.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (Issue No. 19) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 26 to the Journals).

Mr. Forget, from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, presented the Third Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Thursday, April 27, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-170, An

Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, and has agreed to report it with the following amendment:

Clause 5

Add, immediately after line 25 on page 5, the following subclause:

"(1.1) Benefits paid in respect of persons referred to in paragraph 3(1)(b) shall be applied exclusively toward the maintenance, care, training, education or advancement of the persons in respect of whom they were paid."

Your Committee has ordered a reprint of Bill C-170, as amended.

A copy of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence relating to this Bill (Issues Nos. 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 27 to the Journals).

The following Notice of Motion having been called was transferred to Government Orders for consideration at the next sitting of the House pursuant to Standing Order 21(2):

That the annual and supplementary reports of the Canadian Wheat Board for the years 1968-69 and 1969-70 and the annual report for the year 1970-71 be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.—*The President of the Privy Council.*

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. McCleave, seconded by Mr. Ryan, moved,—This House regrets that the government has failed to take measures which would provide all citizens with decent housing at reasonable prices.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the motion expired.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Major and Leblanc (Laurier) for Messrs. Laflamme and Corriveau on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Messrs. Loiselle, Perrault, McNulty and Turner (London East) for Messrs. Guay (St. Boniface), Roy (Laval), Laflamme and Forget on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Francis, Walker and Guay (St. Boniface) for Messrs. Gervais, Legault and Crossman on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo) and Blair for Messrs. Trudel and Côté (Richelieu) on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

At 5.00 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until Monday at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 66

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, JUNE 5, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Final Communiqué issued following the Ministerial Session of the North Atlantic Council held at Bonn, May 30 and 31, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/26.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That the said Communiqué be printed as an Appendix to this day's *Hansard*.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following four Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 30—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre)

1. In each year since the Public Service Pension Adjustment Act of 1959 was passed, how many persons have received payments thereunder?

2. In each of the above years, what was the total amount paid out under the said Act?

3. In each of the above years, what was the average amount paid under the said Act (a) to retired public servants (b) to widows (c) to others?

4. In each of the last five years, either calendar or financial, for which statistics are available, how many

pensions under the Public Service Superannuation Act (a) to retired public servants (b) to widows of public servants or widows of retired public servants, have been discontinued because of the death of the superannuate?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/30.

No. 345—*Mr. Robinson*

1. Of how many Latin American organizations is Canada a member and what are the organizations?

2. What is the annual cost of membership in each of the organizations?

3. What benefits does Canada derive from each of the Latin American organizations to which it belongs?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/345.

No. 489—*Mr. Fortin*

Under the Local Initiatives Programme and since its inception, were funds invested by the Department of Manpower and Immigration in the constituency of Lotbinière and, if so (a) what was the total amount (b) what is the complete list of groups who benefited from the programme (c) what are the details of the agreements reached in the constituency?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/489.

No. 564—*Mr. MacDonald* (Egmont)

1. Was a survey conducted by the Department of Manpower and Immigration in 1971, of 20,000 students at 58 Canadian Universities and Community Colleges and, if so (a) what percentage of these found work for 16 weeks, 12 weeks, 8 weeks, 4 weeks, 2 weeks and no work (b) when were the students surveyed, under what circumstances and by whom (c) what were the questions asked?

2. Of the 20,000 students, how many were in their first post-secondary year?

3. How many of these students did not return to post-secondary training?

4. How do these figures compare with those obtained by Statistics Canada?

5. What explanations are there for any major differences in findings for these two surveys?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/564.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. Basford,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Saltzman, seconded by Mr. Burton, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-201 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should give consideration to the introduction of a measure providing for an independent review body answerable to Parliament with power to limit and control new foreign investment in Canada and the expansion of foreign-owned corporations already established in this country, as well as the take-over of existing Canadian corporations.

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there are no other members who would like to assist the Chair on the procedural argument, I should like to thank the honourable Parliamentary Secretary and the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) for their assistance on the question whether or not this is a reasoned amendment which the Chair should accept as such.

When the amendment was proposed by the honourable Member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltzman), I indicated that I had some doubt whether it was in fact a reasoned amendment as defined by the authorities which bind the Chair. Despite the very lucid and helpful arguments of the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, I must tell the House that he has been unable to convince me that

this amendment does meet the tests required to make a reasoned amendment acceptable to the Chair.

I think there is no disagreement on the authorities; the Parliamentary Secretary dealt fully with them. The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre stated—and I agree with this—that a reasoned amendment must be declaratory of a proposition that opposes the principle of the bill before the House for second reading. This, of course, is very well established in May, in Beauchesne and in the precedents which the Chair must follow.

I should like to deal with this matter firstly on the basis of whether or not the proposed amendment is in opposition to the principle of the bill. With respect, I do not find that it is. The title of the bill is "An act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons". I think I would fairly describe the proposed amendment and the argument of the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre if I were to say that he is proposing another way, an enlarged or different way, in which to achieve the same objectives and also to do other things. If this is the case—and I believe it is—I do not think he is opposing the principle of the bill but is suggesting another way in which the objective of the bill might be obtained. On that basis I would have to say that I cannot accept the proposed amendment.

The honourable Parliamentary Secretary raised two more points. I agree with his first point that the proposed amendment does seem to go beyond the scope of the bill. It not only suggests an alternate way of dealing with the matter with which the bill attempts to deal; it also suggests that the independent review body would deal with other matters as well. I mentioned before the expansion of foreign owned corporations already existing in this country which is referred to in the proposed amendment. It would seem to me that that provision goes beyond the scope of the bill before the House.

If I may deal with the third point for the record, it was argued by the honourable Parliamentary Secretary that this proposition would involve the expenditure of funds. I would agree with the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre on this point. The amendment is merely asking the government to give consideration to such expenditure, and that is all. However, that is not the point on which my decision turns, and I refer to it only because both honourable Members, who argued the case, referred to it.

For the two reasons I have mentioned I very much regret that I cannot accept the proposed amendment as a reasoned amendment that comes within the rules.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. Basford,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain

persons, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to *Standing Order 15(4)*]

(Notices of Motions)

By unanimous consent, item numbered ten was allowed to stand and retain its position.

Mr. McBride, seconded by Mr. Trudel, moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of extending the designation of Renfrew County for special incentives under the Regional Economic Expansion legislation beyond June 30, 1972.—(Notice of Motion No. 11).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. Basford,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

Ordered,—That any recorded division necessary to dispose, without debate, of the question for the second reading of the said bill be deferred until 9.45 o'clock p.m. Tuesday, June 6, 1972.

The Order being read for the consideration of the report stage of Bill C-204, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Motion numbered 1 having been called as follows:

That Bill C-204, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, be amended

(a) by deleting from Clause 5 lines 29 to 37 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"5. Section 35 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"35. (1) The Governor in Council may by regulation extend the application of Part III or Part IV or of both

Parts III and IV to any or all of oats, barley, rye, flax seed or rapeseed or to all of them.

(2) Where the Governor in Council has extended the application of any Part under subsection (1), the provisions of that Part shall be deemed to be re-enacted in this Part, except that

(a) the word "oats", "barley", "rye", "flax seed" or "rapeseed", as the case may be shall be substituted for the word "wheat";

(b) the expression "oat products", "barley products", "rye products", "flax seed products" or "rapeseed products", as the case may be, shall be substituted for the expression "wheat products";

(c) the sum certain per bushel to be fixed by the Governor in Council in respect of oats, barley, rye, flax seed or rapeseed may be so fixed on basis in storage either Thunder Bay or Vancouver or only Thunder Bay or only Vancouver; and"

(b) by adding immediately after line 5 at page 5 the following:

"(3) The Governor in Council shall make any regulation extending the application of Part III or IV or of both Parts III and IV to any of rye, flax seed or rapeseed after considering the possibility of holding a plebiscite of the producers in consultation with the appropriate representatives of such organizations with co-operative or direct membership that are involved in the marketing or production of these three grains."

(c) by renumbering subsequent subsections accordingly.—*Mr. Gleave*.

And a point of order having been raised, a ruling by Mr. Deputy Speaker was deferred to the next sitting of the House.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Trudel and De Bané for Messrs. Langlois and Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean) on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Southam for Mr. Danforth on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse) for Mr. Rodrigue on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Trudeau, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Summary of Orders in Council passed during the month of February, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/352.

At 10.20 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 67

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table,—Extract from the Minutes of a Meeting of the Commissioners of Internal Economy held on April 24, 1972, concerning revisions of the salaries of employees of the House of Commons. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/1.

A petition was presented by the honourable Member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin).

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That speeches on the motion under the order Business of Supply be limited to fifteen minutes with the exception of the mover, the principal speaker on behalf of the government who shall be limited to thirty minutes and the principal speakers of the other opposition parties who shall be limited to twenty minutes.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Thomas (Moncton), seconded by Mr. Baldwin, moved,—This House regrets that the government has failed to develop the National Transportation Policy, pursuant to section 3

of the National Transportation Act, and has failed to take measures to revitalize and rebuild Canadian transportation for present and future needs.

And debate arising thereon;

By unanimous consent, Mr. Jamieson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of the Second Report of the Federal-Provincial Committee on Atlantic Region Transportation. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-5/32.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Thomas (Moncton), seconded by Mr. Baldwin,—This House regrets that the government has failed to develop the National Transportation Policy, pursuant to section 3 of the National Transportation Act, and has failed to take measures to revitalize and rebuild Canadian transportation for present and future needs.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Benjamin, seconded by Mr. Harding, moved in amendment thereto,—That the motion be amended by

changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"and further, as a step toward meeting this end, the House calls upon the Government to give consideration to the introduction of legislation providing for the public ownership of the Canadian Pacific Company, including its railway and ancillary operations, with the objective of providing Canadians with efficient, integrated rail, air, water, communications and inter-provincial trucking systems that give priority to service over profit."

And debate arising thereon;

At 9.45 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Special Order made Monday, June 5, 1972, the debate was interrupted and the question being put on the motion of Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. Basford,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 24)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander,	Drury,	Lajoie,	Morison,	Scott,
Alkenbrack,	Dubé,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Muir,	Sharp,
Asselin,	Fairweather,	Humboldt),	Munro,	Simpson,
Baldwin,	Flemming,	Laniel,	Murphy,	Smerchanski,
Barrett,	Forest,	La Salle,	Murta,	Smith
Basford,	Forget,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Nesbitt,	(Northumberland-
Béchar, d,	Foster,	Lessard	Nielsen,	Miramichi),
Bell,	Francis,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Noble,	Smith
Benson,	Gendron,	L'Heureux,	Noël,	(Saint-Jean),
Bigg,	Gervais,	Lind,	Nowlan,	Southam,
Blair,	Gillespie,	Loiselle,	O'Connell,	Stanfield,
Blouin,	Goyer,	MacDonald	Olson,	Stewart
Borrie,	Gray,	(Egmont),	Osler,	(Cochrane),
Boulanger,	Grills,	Macdonald	Otto,	Sullivan,
Breau,	Groos,	(Rosedale),	Ouellet,	Thomas
Buchanan,	Guay (St. Boniface),	MacEachen,	Paproski,	(Maisonneuve-
Caccia,	Guilbault,	MacKay,	Penner,	Rosemont),
Cafik,	Haidasz,	McBride,	Pepin,	Thomas
Chappell,	Hales,	McCleave,	Perrault,	(Moncton),
Chrétien,	Harkness,	McCutcheon,	Portelance,	Tolmie,
Clermont,	Hogarth,	McGrath,	Reid,	Trudeau,
Coates,	Hopkins,	McKinley,	Richard,	Trudel,
Cobbe,	Howard (Okanagan	McNulty,	Richardson,	Turner
Corriveau,	Boundary),	McQuaid,	Ritchie,	(London East),
Côté (Longueuil),	Hymmen,	Mahoney,	Roberts,	Walker,
Crossman,	Isabelle,	Major,	Robinson,	Watson,
Cullen,	Jerome,	Marceau,	Rochon,	Weatherhead,
Cyr,	Kaplan,	Marchand	Rock,	Whelan,
Deachman,	Knowles (Norfolk-	(Kamloops-	Roy (Timmins),	Whicher,
Deakon,	Haldimand),	Cariboo),	Roy (Laval),	Whiting,
De Bané,	Korchinski,	Monteith,	Rynard,	Woolliams,
Dinsdale,	Lafamme,	Moore,	Schumacher,	Yanakis—144.

NAYS

Messrs.

Barnett,	Burton,	Gleave,	Latulippe,	Rodrigue,
Beaudoin,	Dionne,	Godin,	Lewis,	Rondeau,
Benjamin,	Douglas,	Harding,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Rose,
Blackburn,	Fortin,	Knight,	Nystrom,	Saltsman,
Brewin,	Gauthier,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Orlikow,	Skoberg,
Broadbent,	Gilbert,	North Centre),	Peters,	Tétrault—29.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. McKinley, Downey and Korchinski for Messrs. Cadieu, Gundlock and Schumacher on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Hogarth for Mr. Gibson on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Messrs. Breau, Forget, Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont), Crossman, Southam and Bigg for Messrs. Dupras, Comtois, Côté (Richelieu), Robinson, Crouse and Schumacher on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Messrs. Alkenbrack, Fairweather, McCutcheon and Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) for Messrs. Howe, Murta, Southam and Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley) on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Scott for Mr. Schumacher on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Robinson and Murphy for Messrs. Trudel and Morison on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Isabelle for Mr. Loiselle on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Asselin for Mr. McCutcheon on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. De Bané for Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo) on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Lind and Otto for Messrs. McNulty and Guay (Lévis) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Rodrigue for Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse) on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

At 10.09 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 68

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk of the House had laid upon the Table the Fourth Report of the Clerk of Petitions, which was read as follows:

The Clerk of Petitions has the honour to report that he has examined the petition of Herman Weisz, of the City of Ottawa, Ontario, in relation to a Report entitled "Concentration in the Manufacturing Industries of Canada", dated March 31, 1971 and published by the Queen's Printer for Canada on behalf of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, presented by Mr. Andrew Brewin, Member of Parliament, on Tuesday, June 6, 1972, and finds that the petition meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: The House has just heard the Clerk read the Fourth Report of the Clerk of Petitions in relation to the petition filed yesterday by the honourable Member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). Since the filing of the petition yesterday, I have had an opportunity to study very carefully the contents and substance of that document. The substance of the petition is that the petitioner who was a public servant was largely the author of a report entitled "Concentration in the Manufacturing Industries of Canada" published by the De-

partment of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. This report was attributed to be the work of a public servant, not the petitioner, under the direction of yet another public servant, also not the petitioner.

The suggestion is that it was wrong, inaccurate and in failing to give the petitioner credit for his part in the publication, thereby damaging his reputation. The petitioner urges the House of Commons to cause the person or persons responsible for the alleged wrongful appropriation of his work to publish a correction and to give him credit for his part in the publication.

Honourable Members will recognize that it is a heavy responsibility of the Chair to ensure that petitions are in accordance with the historic practices and usages of the House. There is a fundamental right to petition the House of Commons, but that right should not be used to put aside other and probably more effective remedies. It is my understanding that there is an avenue open to the petitioner which has not been referred to in his statement of grievances. There is a precedent in the year 1956 to the effect that the House will not receive a petition dealing with a matter, the jurisdiction of which has been assigned to another body. This precedent may be found at page 163 of the *Journals* of the House for Thursday, February 16, 1956. I quote from the

Journals of the House as follows: "Mr. Speaker decided that, although the above mentioned petition met the requirements of Standing Order 70 now 67, it was irregular in that it did not set forth a case in which the House had jurisdiction to interfere since Parliament had vested in the Governor in Council and in the Minister of Transport the exclusive authority to approve and issue licences for the operation of private television stations, and that the petition could not be received."

The Chair has other reservations concerning the substance and the language of the petition filed by the honourable Member yesterday. The document is more in the nature of a remonstrance or a listing of grievances rather than a petition as it is understood by our usages and practices.

Included in the substance of the purported petition are statements which, in my opinion, are charges of a very strong character against a minister and a senior departmental official.

As the House knows, assuming a petition to be acceptable from a procedural standpoint, further discussion or consideration of it may be carried out only by consent. We have to go back to the year 1962 for an instance where such unanimous consent was given to allow a debate in the House followed by a referral of the matter to a committee. Perhaps I might be allowed at this point to refer to Dawson's Procedure in the Canadian House of Commons at page 242 dealing with modern practice in relation to petitions. "These rulings and the procedure surrounding the reception of petitions have acted, in recent years in particular, to discouraging petitioning. At many times the House has shown itself willing to waive its rules, however strict, to allow the introduction or the passage of a measure it desires, but it has consistently refused to do the same with petitions. Not only is the possible subject-matter limited today, but the forms are strictly observed. The examination by the Clerk of Petitions ensures that many petitions will never be received by the House. Even if they are drafted properly and deal with a proper subject, the petitions cause little stir in the House: the Speaker informs the House that they may be received and they disappear from sight without comment. At best a Member may present a petition in person and read the prayer; his fellow Members nod agreeably and the petition disappears; there is no debate. The result of these restrictions and this procedure is that petitions are of little use today. Petitions for private bills are still common, but the old tradition by which an individual could pray for redress of wrongs and expect an alleviation of difficulties has fallen into disuse. It is unlikely ever to be revived."

In light of what I have read and said I wonder if honourable Members would not agree that if allegations contained in a document were allowed to be inserted into our records, another possible injustice would not be created.

I might refer honourable Members to Citation 333 of Beauchesne's fourth edition in reference to the use of language in the petition.

For the reasons stated, I feel that the document filed yesterday is not a petition which meets the requirements of the practices and usages of the Canadian House of Commons covering the receipt of petitions.

Because I know the matter is of interest perhaps to all Members, and certainly to the honourable Member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), I suggest the matter cannot be brought to the attention of the House by way of petition. The honourable Member knows as well as I that there are other ways a grievance can be submitted to the House. There are many avenues open to the honourable Member if he wishes to pursue the matter. I suggest with regret that the avenue of a petition is not the proper one at this time.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following three Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 76—*Mr. McCleave*

On what date or dates, and in what amounts, did the National Harbours Board make grants in lieu of taxation for each year since, and inclusive of, 1967, to (a) Halifax (b) Saint John (c) Quebec City (d) Montreal (e) Vancouver?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/76.

No. 429—*Mr. Macquarrie*

1. Which countries where Canadian diplomatic missions are located have not reciprocated this arrangement with the establishment of their own mission in Ottawa?

2. Do any countries with diplomatic missions in Ottawa not have Canadian missions stationed within them and, if so (a) which ones (b) does the government have any plans to establish missions in these countries?

3. Is it intended to open a full-time office in Dacca for the use of officers of the Canadian mission accredited to Bangla Desh and, if so, on what date?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/429.

No. 550—*Mr. Mazankowski*

1. How many farmers filed income tax returns in each province in the years 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969 and 1970?

2. How many of the returns in each province recorded incomes of (a) less than \$2,500 (b) \$2,501-\$5,000 (c) \$5,001-\$7,250 (d) \$7,251-\$10,000 (e) \$10,001 and over for the years 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969 and 1970?

3. What was the total amount of income tax collected from farmers in each province for the years 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969 and 1970?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/550.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 11, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence between Mr. John Carson, Chairman of the Public Service Commission and the Honourable John Turner, Minister of Justice, regarding bilingualism in the Public Service and its application under the terms of the Public Service Employment Act,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Ordered,—That there be laid before this House a copy of the financial statements of the Yukon Native Brotherhood for each fiscal year during which grants have been made to the Brotherhood by any department or agency of the government.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 59—Mr. Nielsen.*)

By unanimous consent, Mr. Gray, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copy of a letter addressed by the Minister of National Revenue to Mr. A. H. Peddle, M.P., dated June 7, 1972, in con-

nection with delays in Income Tax refunds.—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/9.

On motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), it was ordered,—That the Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1971 and the Auditor General's Report thereon be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-211, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Peters, seconded by Mr. Barnett, moved in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-211 be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months hence.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 25)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander,	Downey,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Mather,	Rodrigue,
Asselin,	Fairweather,	North Centre),	Mazankowski,	Rondeau,
Baldwin,	Flemming,	Knowles (Norfolk-	Monteith,	Rose,
Barnett,	Fortin,	Haldimand),	Moore,	Rynard,
Beaudoin,	Gauthier,	Korchinski,	Muir,	Schumacher,
Bell,	Gilbert,	Lambert	Murta,	Scott,
Benjamin,	Gleave,	(Bellechasse),	Nesbitt,	Simpson,
Bigg,	Godin,	Latulippe,	Nielsen,	Skoberg,
Blackburn,	Grills,	Lewis,	Noble,	Southam,
Burton,	Hales,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Nystrom,	Stanfield,
Coates,	Harding,	McCleave,	Orlikow,	Thomas
Diefenbaker,	Harkness,	McCutcheon,	Paproski,	(Moncton),
Dinsdale,	Horner,	McGrath,	Peters,	Valade,
Dionne,	Howe,	McKinley,	Ritchie,	Winch,
Douglas,	Knight,	McQuaid,	Rock,	Woolliams—71.

NAYS

Messrs.

Basford,	Clermont,	Duquet,	Haidasz,	Leblanc (Laurier),
Béchar, d,	Cobbe,	Forest,	Howard (Okanagan	LeBlanc (Rimouski),
Benson,	Corriveau,	Forget,	Boundary),	Lefebvre,
Blair,	Cullen,	Foster,	Hymmen,	Lessard
Blouin,	Cyr,	Francis,	Kaplan,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),
Borrie,	Deachman,	Gendron,	Laflamme,	L'Heureux,
Buchanan,	Deakon,	Gervais,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Lind,
Caccia,	Drury,	Gillespie,	Humboldt),	Loiselle,
Cafik,	Dubé,	Guay (St. Boniface),	La Salle,	

MacDonald (Egmont), Macdonald (Rosedale), MacEachen, McBride, McNulty, Mahoney, Major, Marceau,	Marchand (Kamloops- Cariboo), Munro, Murphy, Noël, O'Connell, Olson, Orange, Osler, Otto,	Pelletier, Penner, Pepin, Perrault, Portelance, Pringle, Reid, Richard, Richardson, Roberts, Robinson,	Roy (Laval), Sharp, Smerchanski, Stewart (Cochrane), Sullivan, Thomas (Maisonneuve- Rosemont), Tolmie, Trudeau,	Trudel, Turner (London East), Turner (Ottawa- Carleton), Walker, Weatherhead, Whicher, Whiting, Yanakis—85.
--	---	--	---	--

And the question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Howard (Okanagan Boundary), Whicher, Fairweather and Knight for Messrs. Pringle, Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay), Lambert (Edmonton West) and Saltsman on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Crossman for Mr. Serré on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. McNulty and Roy (Laval) for Messrs. Lind and Otto on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Brewin for Mr. Peters on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Schumacher for Mr. Danforth on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on Operations under the Farm Improvement Loans Act, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 13 of the said Act, chapter F-3, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/144.

By Mr. Turner,—Report on the Administration of the Small Businesses Loans Act for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 11 of the said Act, chapter S-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/240.

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 69

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Hales, from the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Thursday, May 11, 1972, your Committee has considered the Auditor General's Report on the Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1970, and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the previous session.

Your Committee held 17 meetings in the past session, in which this Report was studied and the following Ministers and officials were in attendance:

November 2, 1971:

From the Department of Agriculture:

The Honourable H. A. Olson, Minister of Agriculture
Mr. Marcel Lessard, Parliamentary Secretary
Mr. S. B. Williams, Deputy Minister
Mr. A. O. Blouin, Secretary Treasurer, Canadian Dairy Commission

November 4, 1971:

From the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce:

Mr. Bruce Howard, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary

Mr. A. G. Kniewasser, Senior Assistant Deputy Minister

Mr. T. Burns, Assistant Deputy Minister, External Services

Mr. I. Craig, General Director, Financial Services Branch

November 9 and 16, 1971:

From the Department of Supply and Services:

Mr. H. R. Balls, Deputy Minister of Services and Deputy Receiver General

Mr. D. R. Yeoman, Assistant Deputy Minister

Dr. A. G. Irvine, Director General, Government of Canada Accounting and Economics Branch

November 23, 1971:

From the Department of Manpower and Immigration:

Mr. S. W. Kaiser, Assistant Deputy Minister (Administration)

Mr. J. L. Manion, Director, Programs Branch, Manpower Division

November 25, 1971:

From the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration:

Mr. J. G. Watson, Director

From the Department of Regional Economic Expansion:

Mr. J. D. Love, Deputy Minister
Mr. M. Fitzgerald, Executive Director, Western Region

November 30, 1971:

From the Department of Regional Economic Expansion:

Mr. J. D. Love, Deputy Minister
Mr. J. P. Francis, Assistant Deputy Minister, Planning
Mr. W. J. Lavigne, Assistant Deputy Minister, Incentives
Mr. D. W. Franklin, Director General, Evaluation and Administration

December 2 and 7, 1971:

From the Department of National Health and Welfare:

Dr. Joseph W. Willard, Deputy Minister, National Welfare
Dr. J. Maurice Leclair, Deputy Minister, National Health
Dr. P. M. Bird, Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, Health
Dr. J. H. Wiebe, Assistant Deputy Minister, Medical Services
Mr. J. A. Blais, Assistant Deputy Minister, Income Security
Mr. G. Lahaie, Director of Fitness and Amateur Sports
Mr. W. J. Trudeau, Director General, Social Insurance
Mr. S. Mansbridge, Assistant Deputy Minister, Administration
Mr. H. Frederiksen, Director, Financial Administration
Mr. G. H. Aubut, Director, Management Review

From the Auditor General's Office at various times:

Mr. A. M. Henderson, Auditor General
Mr. George R. Long, Assistant Auditor General
Mr. E. Cooke, Audit Director
Mr. A. G. Cross, Audit Director
Mr. C. F. Gilhooly, Audit Director
Mr. H. E. Hayes, Audit Director
Mr. A. Rudy, Audit Director
Mr. J. A. Wyatt, Audit Director

Your Committee gave consideration to the following paragraphs in the Report of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1970:

Crown Corporations:

Paragraphs 235, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 253, 254, 255, 257 and 258.

Department of Agriculture:

Paragraphs 60, 61, 62, 222, 276, 277 and 278.

Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce:

Paragraphs 72, 73, 74 and Item 36 of Appendix 1.

Department of Manpower and Immigration:

Paragraph 78.

Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration:
Paragraphs 155 and 156.

Department of Regional Economic Expansion:
Paragraphs 157, 158, 159 and 228.

Department of National Health and Welfare:
Paragraphs 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 189 and 281.

Your Committee also devoted two meetings to consideration of paragraph 7, Speeding up Production of the Public Accounts and the Report of the Auditor General and has set up a Subcommittee to study and report further on this matter.

* * * * *

PARAGRAPH 6—RECOMMENDATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS NOT YET IMPLEMENTED OR DEALT WITH

At the request of the Committee, the Research Branch of the Library of Parliament has prepared a summary of recommendations and observations by the Public Accounts Committee from 1930 to 1970. In addition, the Chairman has written to Ministers of the Crown seeking information on what follow-up action has been taken on some of the more outstanding items and your Committee intends to give further attention to the replies received from the Ministers.

Your Committee hopes to give more detailed study to the useful report prepared by the Research Branch and to comment further at a later date.

PARAGRAPH 7—SPEEDING UP PRODUCTION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND THE REPORT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

As mentioned in the introductory portion of this report, your Committee devoted two meetings to consideration of this paragraph.

To follow up further on this matter, your Committee has appointed a subcommittee to study and report back to this Committee on ways and means of speeding up the preparation, presentation and consideration of the Public Accounts of Canada and the Auditor General's Report thereon. Representation on the subcommittee consists of four members of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts: the Auditor General; the Secretary of the Treasury Board; the Deputy Minister of Services and a representative of the Department of Finance.

In view of the fact that this question is at present under study by the subcommittee, your Committee will await receipt of the subcommittee's report before commenting on this matter.

PARAGRAPH 47—WEAKENING OF PARLIAMEN- TARY CONTROL

Section 25 of the Financial Administration Act reads as follows:

"All estimates of expenditures submitted to Parliament shall be for services coming in course of payment during the fiscal year."

As explained in paragraph 47 of the Auditor General's Report, this is one of the most important controls exercised by Parliament over public expenditure. However, "this control is seriously weakened when funds are credited to special accounts to be available for spending in future years." (Auditor General's 1970 Report, page 24)

The creation of open fund accounts or running balances available from year to year allows departments, Crown Corporations or agencies to hold large sums at their disposal and, "is a means of circumventing Parliament's instruction that all estimates that are submitted to it shall be for the services coming in course of payment during the fiscal year." (Auditor General's 1970 Report, page 23)

During its proceedings, the attention of your Committee was drawn to the following amounts in the Estimates for 1969-70 which were not required during the year but which did not lapse at the year-end in compliance with section 35 of the Financial Administration Act:

Agriculture Vote 17b

Reserve for wheat inventory reduction payments	\$ 100,000,000
Secretary of State Vote 30	
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation..	11,993,000
Transport Vote 80	
National Harbours Board—Special Account	2,036,000
Treasury Board Vote 5a	
Reserve for salary revisions 1969-70..	58,656,000
	<hr/>
	\$ 172,685,000

In the first of the aforementioned cases (Agriculture Vote 17b) the estimate was submitted for money to be spent in the following year. It is difficult to reconcile this practice with Section 25 of the Financial Administration Act, quoted above, and it is one that should be studied more closely.

In the latter three cases, (Secretary of State Vote 30, Transport Vote 80, and Treasury Board Vote 5a) special wording of the vote texts was involved. The amounts appropriated were not required during the year, but did not lapse at year-end in compliance with Section 35 of the Financial Administration Act, "because of the special wording of the vote texts in the Appropriation Acts which received the approval of Parliament when the Appropriation Acts were passed." (Auditor General's 1970 Report, page 23)

As an example of this special wording, comparison is made between the Appropriation Act for the C.B.C. (Secretary of State Vote 30) in 1968-69 and 1969-70.

In 1968-69, this reads:

Grant in respect of the net operating amount required to discharge the responsibilities of the broadcasting service.

Under this wording in 1968-69, any funds not required by the C.B.C. were returned to the Consolidated Revenue Fund at year-end.

In 1969-70, the vote reads as follows:

Payment to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for operating expenditures in providing a broadcasting service.

The word "grant" was changed to "payment" in the 1969-70 appropriation, and thus, the \$11,993,000 not required by the C.B.C. in that year did not lapse at year-end as in previous years, but rather, was retained by the C.B.C.

Your Committee, seized with the importance of the wording, and the slight variations thereof, of the Votes listed in the Appropriation Act, therefore recommends that when there is a change in the normal course of presentation of estimates e.g. in the wording or standards which previously prevailed that a note or other indication calling attention to the variation be included in the particular item.

PARAGRAPH 48—CONTINGENCIES VOTE

In its Thirteenth Report 1966-67, the Committee expressed concern that large sums are placed in the hands of the Executive for the supplementing of appropriations of various departments. In that Report, your Committee recommended

... . .

that there be no change in the Treasury Board's procedure whereby it is the agency which determines the Government's overall cash requirements in stated areas, e.g. salary increases. However, once this determination is completed and the individual departmental needs established, the Committee believes that the additional amount required by each department should be made the subject of a supplementary estimate prepared by the department concerned for submission to Parliament for its consideration and appropriation in the usual manner.

Your Committee appreciates the change in the wording of Vote 5 but is still concerned over the resulting continuance of the annual Contingencies Vote. Of even greater concern to your Committee is the extension of the purposes of this vote in 1968-69 and 1969-70, which allowed the establishment of a reserve from the unused balance of the appropriation, from which payments may be made in respect of salary increases relating to previous years. This practice resulted in a reserve fund of \$64,332,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1969-70.

Your Committee is disturbed by the existence of such a substantial reserve fund. It therefore strongly reiterates the recommendation made in its Thirteenth Report 1966-67 to the effect that any additional amounts required by each department should be made the subject of a supplementary estimate prepared by the department concerned for submission to Parliament for its consideration and appropriation in the usual manner.

**PARAGRAPH 60—FEES LEGALLY COLLECTABLE
DEFERRED AS ANTI-INFLATION-
ARY MEASURE**

This paragraph deals with free overtime work provided on the basis of a forty-hour week by Department of Agriculture inspectors at meat packing plants. In October 1968 the work week of the Veterinary Science Group was reduced to thirty-seven and a half hours; the Committee expresses its concern however over the fact that it was not until January 1970 that the regulations were changed to provide for free inspection services on the basis of the revised week. For the intervening period of one year and four months the Department absorbed the cost of the two and one-half hours differential to an estimated cost of \$400,000 for a fiscal year.

The Committee is of the opinion that the Department of Agriculture should have acted more expeditiously to amend its regulations.

**PARAGRAPH 61—DEFICIT OF CANADIAN DAIRY
COMMISSION FINANCED BY
MEANS OF LOANS**

**PARAGRAPH 222—LOANS TO, AND INVESTMENTS
IN CROWN CORPORATIONS—
CANADIAN DAIRY COMMISSION**

Your Committee requests the Canadian Dairy Commission to report to the Committee on its present policy in this connection.

**PARAGRAPH 62—STUDY REPORT RECEIVED TOO
LATE TO BE OF USE**

A consultant under contract to the Department of Agriculture submitted two oral interim reports but failed to deliver his final written report by the due date of September 15, 1968 or the extended due date of March 1, 1969. The consultant was therefore notified that the contract was terminated on account of non-delivery of the final report, but in the meantime he had received \$23,900 in progress payments out of a total agreed fee of \$37,500.

In January 1970 the consultant submitted some copies of his report but these were refused and he was informed that the Department of Agriculture was considering instituting legal proceedings against him for the recovery of the monies advanced to him.

The Committee has been informed by Department of Agriculture officials that the question of legal proceedings is still under study by the departmental legal advisers.

The Committee understands that the Department of Agriculture still has the matter under consideration and requests a written report from the Department as to the outcome of this matter.

**PARAGRAPH 72—WEAKNESSES IN CONTROL OF A
SHARED COST DEVELOPMENT
PROJECT**

The Auditor General's Report has pointed out a number of weaknesses in administration of a contract to assist a company in the development of avionics products. In spite of these weaknesses, however, your Committee was informed by officials of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce that the objectives of the project were met, namely, product diversification and an increase in the company's sales of avionic products.

Nevertheless your Committee is of the opinion that the Auditor General's criticisms concerning an improper charge to the fiscal year 1967-68 are valid and recommends that closer attention be paid to operating within the framework of the Financial Administration Act. The Committee is satisfied with the assurances of Departmental officials that this will be done in future.

Your Committee recommends that efforts be made to improve communication between Treasury Board and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

**PARAGRAPH 73—INADEQUATE CONTROL OF CON-
TRACTS RESULTING IN FAILURE
TO COLLECT REVENUE DUE THE
CROWN**

Under a cost-sharing programme whose primary purpose is to develop defence and related civil products for export sales, the Departments of Supply and Services and of Industry, Trade and Commerce have entered into agreements with certain contractors providing for contributions by the Crown to approved projects. These agreements normally include a provision whereby the Crown may recoup its investment from profits realized by the contractor on sales of the product.

The Auditor General's Report commented that in the past there has been a certain laxity in "follow-on" procedures to ensure recouping amounts due to the Crown from contractors.

Your Committee has ascertained by questioning Departmental officials that new procedures have been instituted and administration of the programme simplified by assigning full responsibility for the administration of the contracts to one department only, that is the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Your Committee appreciates knowing that there is a new set of regulations set forth in this procedure and trusts that it will result in the collection of amounts due the Crown.

**PARAGRAPH 74—FAILURE TO COLLECT MONIES
DUE THE CROWN**

This paragraph deals with a situation similar to that dealt with in the previous paragraph, and in particular with the question of whether the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce had the necessary authority to advance additional funds to a contractor for maintaining production rather than for development. Your Committee has ascertained that there is a difference of opinion between the Auditor General and the Department on the legality of this additional advance but understands that legal opinion is being sought.

Your Committee is concerned with the lack of communication between Departments which became apparent during questioning of officials of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. As other Departments are concerned in this matter, your Committee intends to re-open consideration of this paragraph on some future occasion.

**PARAGRAPH 78—EXAMINATION OF CANADA MAN-
POWER CENTRES AND REGIONAL
OFFICES**

The Committee is concerned to note that following an examination of 10% of the Canada Manpower Centres and Regional Offices of the Department of Manpower and Immigration across Canada, the Auditor General noted a number of serious weaknesses in the control of transactions relating to the Adult Occupational Training Program, the Manpower Mobility Program and the Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons Program. The Committee is pleased to note that amended procedures have been issued designed to correct many of the weaknesses, and requests that the Auditor General continue to give close scrutiny to implementation of these amended procedures. It also expresses the hope that he might be able to increase the number of offices included in his check.

**PARAGRAPH 119—PROVINCIAL PAYMENTS TO
FEDERAL HOSPITALS UNDER
THE HOSPITAL AND DIAGNOS-
TIC SERVICES ACT**

Your Committee appreciates the difficulty of procuring accountants for northern hospitals. Although pleased that conditions have improved, your Committee remains concerned over the inability of the Auditor General to determine whether the terms of the agreements with the various provinces under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act relating to payments to federal hospitals are being observed in all cases. Your Committee wishes to point out that unless the records of the hospitals are established and maintained in accordance with the Canadian Hospital Accounting Manual, and kept up to date so that the hospital returns are prepared and submitted promptly to the provincial hospital service plans, it is not possible to determine whether *per diem* rates

received by the hospitals are equitable and in accordance with the terms of the agreements with the provinces.

**PARAGRAPH 120—CONTINGENCIES VOTE USED TO
SUPPLEMENT FUNDS PROVIDED
BY STATUTE**

Your Committee wishes to record disapproval of the action of the Treasury Board in approving payment of \$589,000 as a charge to 1969-70 Treasury Board Vote 5—Contingencies when the authority of Parliament was required to make this additional payment because of the fact that the Fitness and Amateur Sport Act statutory provision of \$5 million for payments had already been disbursed to the extent of \$4,984,000.

**PARAGRAPH 122—OVERPAYMENTS IN THE OLD
AGE SECURITY PROGRAM**

Your Committee remains concerned with the extent of the overpayments in the Old Age Security Program. It notes that irregular payments of \$961,000 have been made and that the Department of National Health and Welfare has been diligent in recovering \$375,000 to March 31, 1970 and requests the Department to file a report with the Committee showing the status of recoveries up to the present date.

**PARAGRAPH 123—GUARANTEED INCOME
SUPPLEMENT**

After considering the effectiveness of the administration of this program by the Department of National Health and Welfare, your Committee is of the view that a test of 5% of each year's claims was too low in light of the overpayments disclosed by the tests as reported by the Auditor General. Your Committee was of the opinion that this rate should be increased and is pleased to learn that the Department has increased the percentage of tests.

**PARAGRAPH 155—SUBSIDIZATION OF IRRIGATION
PROJECTS**

In this paragraph the Auditor General has commented on three irrigation projects carried on under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, that is, the Bow River and the St. Mary irrigation projects in Alberta and irrigation areas in southwest Saskatchewan.

In questioning the Director of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration your Committee noted the similarities between the Bow River and St. Mary irrigation projects in which the Federal Government is subsidizing the projects at the rate of over \$1 million a year.

Your Committee has been informed that negotiations are under way which would have the result of the Province of Alberta assuming operating responsibilities for these two projects. Your Committee urges that these negotiations be energetically pursued with the aim of concluding them in favour of the Federal Government as soon as possible.

PARAGRAPH 156—INADEQUATE MANAGEMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATION

This paragraph draws attention to under-utilization of some of the vehicles owned by the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration but your Committee was also interested in the wider implications of motor vehicle management in other large government fleet operations and whether any action has been taken on the Auditor General's recommendation that the Treasury Board initiate a study on this subject.

Your Committee has since been informed that a study is under way concerned with Treasury Board policy relating to all aspects of the procurement and use of motor vehicles in the government service, including the use of privately owned vehicles. It is understood that this study should lead to a proposed policy for Treasury Board approval during the first half of 1972. Your Committee awaits the result of this study with great interest.

PARAGRAPH 157—TRANSFER OF WORKS FROM MARITIME MARSHLAND REHABILITATION TO THE MARITIME PROVINCES

In earlier Reports the Auditor General has drawn attention to the fact that the Maritime Provinces had not assumed responsibility for the operation and maintenance of works under the Maritime Marshland Rehabilitation Act, although it was Parliament's intention that this be done as soon as possible after completion of the projects. It would now appear that this transfer of responsibility from Federal to Provincial Government has taken place accompanied by substantial grants to the provinces. The Auditor General has pointed out that grants must receive the prior specific approval of Parliament and this was not done in this case. Departmental officials were of the opinion that the action was not irregular as the payments constituted a contribution, which does not require the prior approval of Parliament, rather than a grant, which does. Your Committee has been unable to resolve this difference of opinion owing to a clear lack of definition of the terms "contribution" and "grant".

PARAGRAPH 247—CANADA DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Your Committee has noted that as a proprietary corporation the CDIC is subject to income tax but that under Section 22 of the Financial Administration Act, Order in Council P.C. 1968-10/585 of March 28, 1968, remitted any income tax payable by the Corporation.

Originally it was not expected that the Corporation would make a profit but your Committee has noted that it is now in a very profitable situation with a profit in 1969 of almost \$1.5 million. Your Committee is of the opinion that the remission should be revoked and this Corporation required to pay income tax.

Your Committee has noted, too, that provincially-incorporated trust companies are not required to come

within the provisions of the Act governing this Corporation, although they may apply to do so if they wish. Your Committee's attention was drawn to the bankruptcy of a major provincially-incorporated trust company resulting in losses of large sums of money.

PARAGRAPH 276—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS BOARD

The Committee noted that this Board is not active and suggests that consideration be given to incorporating its functions with those of the Agricultural Stabilization Board.

PARAGRAPH 281—CANADA PENSION PLAN ACCOUNT

The Committee wishes to direct the attention of the House to the fact that although the Auditor General is carrying out an examination of the transactions in the Canada Pension Plan Account and the Canada Pension Plan Investment Fund and reporting thereon to the House in the manner described in his Report, there is no requirement in the Canada Pension Plan Act for the Auditor General to report on these statements. The Committee is of the opinion that the Act establishing the Canada Pension Plan should be amended to provide for this at the first suitable opportunity.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 44 to 57 inclusive of the previous session and No. 5 of the current session*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 28 to the Journals*).

By unanimous consent, pursuant to Standing Order 43, Mr. Pringle, seconded by Mr. Robinson, moved,—That in the light of the damage in Canada and the United States arising from the recent oil spill at the Cherry Point Refinery this House support the urgency of a reference to the International Joint Commission of the environmental consequences of the movement of oil in the narrow waters of the Straits of Juan de Fuca, Georgia Strait, and Puget Sound both now and in the future and of the measures necessary to minimize the hazards, and requests the Secretary of State for External Affairs to immediately convey the terms of this motion to the Government of the United States.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Fortin, seconded by Mr. Rondeau, moved,—That the House do now proceed to the Orders of the Day.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 26)

YEAS

Messrs.

Beaudoin,	Gauthier,	Lambert	Latulippe,	Rodrigue,
Dionne,	Godin,	(Bellechasse),	Matte,	Rondeau,
Fortin,				Tétrault—11.

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander,	De Bané,	Knowles (Norfolk-	Mather,	Rose,
Andras,	Diefenbaker,	Haldimand),	Mazankowski,	Roy (Laval),
Barrett,	Dinsdale,	Korchinski,	Monteith,	Schumacher,
Basford,	Drury,	Laflamme,	Moore,	Scott,
Béchar, d,	Dubé,	Laing (Vancouver	Morison,	Sharp,
Beer,	Flemming,	South),	Muir,	Skoberg,
Bell,	Forget,	La Salle,	Munro,	Skoreyko,
Benjamin,	Foster,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Murphy,	Smerchanski,
Bigg,	Francis,	Lefebvre,	Murta,	Southam,
Blackburn,	Gervais,	Lessard	Nesbitt,	Stafford,
Blair,	Gilbert,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Nielsen,	Stanbury,
Blouin,	Gillespie,	Lewis,	Nowlan,	Stanfield,
Boulanger,	Gleave,	L'Heureux,	Nystrom,	Stewart
Breau,	Goyer,	Loiselle,	O'Connell,	(Cochrane),
Broadbent,	Grills,	Macdonald	Olson,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Buchanan,	Guay (St. Boniface),	(Rosedale),	Orange,	Kootenay),
Burton,	Guilbault,	MacEachen,	Osler,	Sulatycky,
Caccia,	Haidasz,	MacGuigan,	Paproski,	Sullivan,
Cadieu,	Hales,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Pelletier,	Thomas
Cafik,	Harding,	Mackasey,	Penner,	(Moncton),
Chrétien,	Harkness,	McCleave,	Pepin,	Trudeau,
Clermont,	Hellyer,	McGrath,	Perrault,	Trudel,
Coates,	Hogarth,	McKinley,	Peters,	Turner
Cobbe,	Horner,	McQuaid,	Portelance,	(London East),
Corriveau,	Howard (Okanagan	Mahoney,	Pringle,	Valade,
Côté (Longueuil),	Boundary),	Major,	Ricard,	Walker,
Cullen,	Howe,	Marceau,	Richard,	Watson,
Cyr,	Hymmen,	Marchand	Richardson,	Weatherhead,
Danforth,	Kaplan,	(Langelier),	Ritchie,	Whiting,
Danson,	Knight,	Marchand	Roberts,	Winch,
Deachman,	Knowles (Winnipeg	(Kamloops-	Robinson,	Woolliams,
Deakon,	North Centre),	Cariboo),	Rochon,	Yanakis—147.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Pringle, seconded by Mr. Robinson,—That in the light of the damage in Canada and the United States arising from the recent oil spill at the Cherry Point Refinery this House support the urgency of a reference to the International Joint Commission of the environmental consequences of the movement of oil in the narrow waters of the Straits of Juan de Fuca, Georgia Strait, and Puget Sound both now and in the future and of the measures necessary to minimize the hazards, and requests the Secretary of State for External Affairs to immediately convey the terms of this motion to the Government of the United States.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Woolliams, moved in amendment thereto,—That the motion be amended by adding at the end thereof:

"and that the International Joint Commission have a mandate to utilize and requisition such financial and other resources of Canada and the United States as will best and soonest restore the ecology and environment on the West Coast to pre-spill conditions."

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Sharp, moved,—That the debate be now adjourned.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 27)

YEAS

Messrs.

Andras,	Danson,	Jamieson,	Marchand	Roberts,
Barrett,	Deachman,	Kaplan,	(Langelier),	Robinson,
Basford,	Deakon,	Laflamme,	Marchand	Rochon,
Béchar, Béchard,	De Bané,	Laing	(Kamloops-	Roy (Laval),
Beer,	Drury,	(Vancouver South),	Cariboo),	Sharp,
Blair,	Dubé,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Morison,	Smerchanski,
Blouin,	Forget,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Munro,	Stafford,
Boulanger,	Foster,	Lefebvre,	Murphy,	Stanbury,
Breau,	Francis,	Lessard	O'Connell,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Buchanan,	Gillespie,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Orange,	Kootenay),
Caccia,	Goyer,	Loiselle,	Osler,	Trudeau,
Cafik,	Gray,	Macdonald	Pelletier,	Trudel,
Chrétien,	Guay (St. Boniface),	(Rosedale),	Penner,	Turner
Clermont,	Guilbault,	MacEachen,	Pepin,	(London East),
Cobbe,	Haidasz,	MacGuigan,	Perrault,	Walker,
Corriveau,	Hogarth,	Mackasey,	Portelance,	Watson,
Côté (Longueuil),	Howard (Okanagan	Mahoney,	Pringle,	Weatherhead,
Cullen,	Boundary),	Marceau,	Richard,	Whiting,
Cyr,	Hymmen,		Richardson,	Yanakis—85.

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander,	Dinsdale,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Mazankowski,	Rose,
Bell,	Flemming,	North Centre),	Moore,	Schumacher,
Benjamin,	Gilbert,	Knowles (Norfolk-	Muir,	Scott,
Bigg,	Gleave,	Haldimand),	Nesbitt,	Skoberg,
Blackburn,	Grills,	Lewis,	Nielsen,	Skoreyko,
Broadbent,	Hales,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Nowlan,	Southam,
Burton,	Harding,	McCleave,	Nystrom,	Stanfield,
Cadieu,	Horner,	McKinley,	Paproski,	Thomas
Coates,	Howe,	McQuaid,	Peters,	(Moncton),
Danforth,	Knight,	Mather,	Ricard,	Winch,
			Ritchie,	Woolliams—49.

Mr. Peters, seconded by Mr. Mather, moved,—That the House do now adjourn.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 28)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander,	Dinsdale,	Knowles (Norfolk-	Mazankowski,	Rose,
Alkenbrack,	Flemming,	Haldimand),	Moore,	Schumacher,
Bell,	Gilbert,	Lambert	Muir,	Scott,
Benjamin,	Grills,	(Edmonton West),	Nielsen,	Skoberg,
Bigg,	Hales,	Lewis,	Nowlan,	Skoreyko,
Blackburn,	Harding,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Nystrom,	Southam,
Broadbent,	Horner,	McCleave,	Paproski,	Thomas
Burton,	Knight,	McKinley,	Peters,	(Moncton),
Cadieu,	Knowles (Winnipeg	McQuaid,	Ricard,	Woolliams—45.
Coates,	North Centre),	Mather,	Ritchie,	

NAYS

Messrs.

Andras,	Drury,	Laing	Marchand	Rochon,
Basford,	Dubé,	(Vancouver South),	(Kamloops-	Roy (Laval),
Béchar, d,	Forget,	La Salle,	Cariboo),	Sharp,
Beer,	Foster,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Morison,	Smerchanski,
Blair,	Francis,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Munro,	Stafford,
Blouin,	Gillespie,	Lefebvre,	Murphy,	Stanbury,
Boulanger,	Goyer,	Lessard	O'Connell,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Buchanan,	Gray,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Pelletier,	Kootenay),
Caccia,	Guay (St. Boniface),	Loiselle,	Penner,	Trudel,
Chrétien,	Guilbault,	Macdonald	Pepin,	Turner
Clermont,	Haidasz,	(Rosedale),	Perrault,	(London East),
Cobbe,	Hogarth,	Mackasey,	Portelance,	Walker,
Cullen,	Howard (Okanagan	Mahoney,	Pringle,	Watson,
Deachman,	Boundary),	Major,	Richard,	Weatherhead,
Deakon,	Isabelle,	Marceau,	Richardson,	Whiting,
De Bané,	Kaplan,		Roberts,	Yanaklis—71.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Ritchie for Mr. Alkenbrack on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Downey for Mr. Fairweather on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Orlikow for Mr. Brewin on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski) for Mr. Crossman on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Schumacher and Horner for Messrs. Fairweather and Hales on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 70

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

And the Business set down for consideration under the said heading in this day's sitting having been called and not proceeded with, the House proceeded to Government Orders.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Pringle, seconded by Mr. Robinson,—That in the light of the damage in Canada and the United States arising from the recent oil spill at the Cherry Point Refinery this House support the urgency of a reference to the International Joint Commission of the environmental consequences of the movement of oil in the narrow waters of the Straits of Juan de Fuca, Georgia Strait, and Puget Sound both now and in the future and of the measures necessary to minimize the hazards, and requests the Secretary of State for External Affairs to immediately convey the terms of this motion to the Government of the United States.

And on the motion of Mr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Woolliams, in amendment thereto,—That the motion be amended by adding at the end thereof:

"and that the International Joint Commission have a mandate to utilize and requisition such financial and other resources of Canada and the United States as

will best and soonest restore the ecology and environment on the West Coast to pre-spill conditions."

After further debate, the question being put on the said amendment, it was agreed to.

And the question being put on the main motion, as amended, it was agreed to.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West) for Mr. Ritchie on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. McQuaid for Mr. Southam on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Blackburn for Mr. Skoberg on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Benjamin for Mr. Skoberg on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

At 5.07 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until Monday at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 71

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Basford, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-213, An Act to amend the National Housing Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to amend the National Housing Act; to widen the definition of a cooperative housing project and provide for insurable loans thereto; to provide for the reimbursement to an approved lender of all legal costs incurred in acquiring title to mortgaged property which is subsequently conveyed to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation; to increase from fifteen billion to nineteen billion dollars the aggregate amount of all loans in respect of which insurance policies have been issued under the Act; to provide that loans to non-profit organizations for low rental housing projects may in certain circumstances be for an amount that is equal to one hundred percent of the lending value of the project; to provide for contributions by the Corporation not to exceed ten percent of the capital cost of the project to non-profit organizations for low rental housing projects;

to increase the payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund from eight billion to an amount not exceeding in the aggregate ten billion dollars for the purpose of the Corporation to make certain loans, and, to provide out of moneys authorized by Parliament for reimbursing it for certain contributions and losses and for paying certain of its costs and expenses; to provide in the aggregate three hundred million dollars out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and any additional amounts authorized by Parliament under the circumstances and conditions described for loans by the Corporation for a Neighbourhood Improvements Program for the period ending March 31, 1977 and, out of moneys appropriated by Parliament for contributions, losses, costs and expenses incurred by the Corporation for the said Program; to provide, in the aggregate one hundred million dollars out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and any additional amounts authorized by Parliament under the conditions and circumstances described for loans by the Corporation and for the forgiveness of part thereof in relation to the rehabilitation of existing family housing units and, out of moneys appropriated by Parliament, for losses, costs and expenses incurred by the Corporation in relation to the said program of rehabilitation; to provide, under the circumstances described, for loans and contributions by the Corporation to facilitate home ownership; under Part

V of the Act, to increase the Corporation's authority in research and development, to clarify its authority to implement training programs and to provide educational facilities, to provide for the Corporation to enter into contracts to underwrite sales of certain equipment or component parts with the maximum contingent liability thereunder not to exceed at any time ten million dollars but providing that any payments under such contracts shall not be included in computing the aggregate of payments made under the said Part, to provide financial assistance in the undertaking of a project for a family of low income up to a maximum contribution of ten thousand dollars for any one project except where otherwise authorized by regulations, and to provide in the aggregate out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund twenty-five million dollars and any additional amounts authorized by Parliament for any losses incurred by the Corporation as a result of projects undertaken and, out of moneys appropriated by Parliament for the Corporation's contributions, costs and expenses; to enable the Corporation to make loans to provinces, municipalities and public housing agencies for the purpose of assisting them in acquiring and servicing land that is not solely for housing purposes and to provide in all cases for security other than a first mortgage, for the extension of the term to twenty-five years, for the lessening of the repayment loans, and for the indefinite extension of the operation of such loans; and further to provide for an increase from two hundred million to three hundred million the amount of capital to the Corporation for the purpose of making loans for municipal sewerage treatment projects.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following two Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 87—*Mr. Coates*

1. What was the total work force of all government information offices prior to the establishment of Information Canada?

2. What is the work force of all government information offices at the present time?

3. What is the total work force of Information Canada at the present time?

4. What is the total budget of Information Canada for the fiscal year 1971-72, and of that amount, how much

is earmarked for salaries, wages, and special personal contracts for services rendered?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/87.

No. 499—*Mr. Rodrigue*

Under the Local Initiatives Programme and since its inception, were funds invested by the Department of Manpower and Immigration in the constituency of Beauce and, if so (a) what was the total amount (b) what is the complete list of groups who benefited from the programme (c) what amount was granted to each group?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/499.

Mr. Cullen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Benson,—That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

And debate continuing;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.02 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Fairweather for Mr. Downey on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

At 10.26 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 72

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Benson,— That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

And debate continuing;

At 9.45 o'clock p.m., Mr. Deputy Speaker interrupted the proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 60(8);

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on the following division:

(Division No. 29)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand,
Badanai,
Barrett,
Bastford,
Béchar, d,
Beer,
Blouin,
Borrie,
Boulanger,
Breau,
Caccia,
Cafik,
Chappell,
Clermont,
Cobbe,

Corriveau,
Côté (Longueuil),
Crossman,
Cullen,
Cyr,
Danson,
Deachman,
Deakon,
De Bané,
Drury,
Dubé,
Dupras,
Duquet,
Éthier,
Faulkner,

Forest,
Forget,
Foster,
Francis,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gibson,
Gillespie,
Goode,
Goyer,
Guay (St. Boniface),
Guilbault,
Howard (Okanagan
Boundary),
Hymmen,

Isabelle,
Jerome,
Kaplan,
Laflamme,
Laing
(Vancouver South),
Lajoie,
Lang (Saskatoon-
Humboldt),
Langlois,
Laniel,
La Salle,
Leblanc (Laurier),
LeBlanc (Rimouski),
Lefebvre,

Legault,
Lessard (LaSalle),
Lessard
(Lac-Saint-Jean),
L'Heureux,
Loiselle,
Macdonald
(Rosedale),
MacEachen,
MacGuigan,
McBride,
McNulty,
Mahoney,
Major,
Marceau,

Marchand (Langelier),	Otto,	Rochon,	Stewart	Turner
Marchand	Ouellet,	Roy (Timmins),	(Cochrane),	(London East),
(Kamloops- Cariboo),	Pelletier,	Sharp,	Sulatycky,	Turner (Ottawa- Carleton),
Morison,	Pepin,	Smith	Sullivan,	Wahn,
Munro,	Portelance,	(Northumberland- Miramichi),	Thomas	Walker,
Noël,	Pringle,	Smith	(Maisonneuve- Rosemont),	Watson,
O'Connell,	Prud'homme,	(Saint-Jean),	Tolmie,	Weatherhead,
Orange,	Reid,	Stafford,	Trudeau,	Whelan,
Osler,	Richardson,	Stanbury,	Trudel,	Whicher,
	Roberts,			Whiting—112.
	Robinson,			

NAYS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Fairweather,	Korchinski,	McGrath,	Rose,
Alexander,	Flemming,	Lambert	McKinley,	Rowland,
Alkenbrack,	Forrestall,	(Bellechasse),	McQuaid,	Ryan,
Baldwin,	Gauthier,	Lambert	Mather,	Rynard,
Barnett,	Gilbert,	(Edmonton West),	Matte,	Saltsman,
Beaudoin,	Gleave,	Laprise,	Mazankowski,	Scott,
Bell,	Godin,	Lewis,	Monteith,	Skoreyko,
Benjamin,	Grills,	MacDonald	Muir,	Southam,
Brewin,	Gundlock,	(Egmont),	Nesbitt,	Stanfield,
Broadbent,	Hales,	MacInnis (Cape	Nystrom,	Stewart
Burton,	Harding,	Breton-East	Orlikow,	(Marquette),
Cadieu,	Horne,	Richmond),	Paproski,	Tétrault,
Carter,	Howard (Skeena),	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Peddle,	Thompson
Coates,	Howe,	MacKay,	Peters,	(Red Deer),
Crouse,	Knight,	MacLean,	Ricard,	Thomson
Danforth,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Macquarrie,	Ritchie,	(Battleford- Kindersley),
Dinsdale,	North Centre),	MacRae,	Rock,	Woolliams—83.
Dionne,	Knowles (Norfolk- Haldimand),	McCleave,	Rodrigue,	
Douglas,		McCutcheon,	Rondeau,	

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Danforth for Mr. Downey on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Saltsman, Ritchie and Goode for Messrs. Knight, Schumacher and Buchanan on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. MacGuigan and Morison for Messrs. Hogarth and Murphy on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Crossman for Mr. Penner on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo) for Mr. Guay (St. Boniface) on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Messrs. Crouse, Southam and Dupras for Messrs. Bigg, Noble and Breau on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Schumacher for Mr. McCutcheon on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Breau for Mr. Perrault on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Legault and Francis for Messrs. Turner (London East) and L'Heureux on the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Messrs. Whiting and Osler for Messrs. Breau and Roy (Laval) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

At 10.10 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 73

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Gervais, from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, presented the Fourth Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Tuesday, May 2, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-6, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, and has agreed to report it with the following amendments:

Clause 2

Strike out line 33 on page 2 and substitute the following therefor:

"subsection 178.15 (1) or any person who in good faith aids in any way a person whom he has reasonable and probable grounds to believe is acting in accordance with any such authorization or permit;"

Strike out lines 33 to 36 inclusive on page 3 and substitute the following therefor:

"jurisdiction, or a judge as defined in section 482 and shall be signed by the Attorney General of the Province in which the application is made or the Solicitor General of Canada or an agent specially designated in writing for the purposes of this section by"

24960—25

Amend the French version by striking out line 49 on page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"tion se situant dans cette province,"

Strike out lines 1 and 2 on page 4 and substitute the following therefor:

"and shall be accompanied by an affidavit which may be sworn on the information and belief of a peace officer or public"

Amend the French version by striking out lines 18 and 19 on page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"lieu où les communications privées pourront être interceptées ou la façon dont elles pourront l'être;"

Strike out lines 27 to 33 inclusive on page 5 and substitute the following therefor:

"or a judge as defined in section 482 upon receipt by him of a written application signed by the Attorney General of the province in which the application is made or the Solicitor General of Canada or an agent specially designated in writing for the purposes of section 178.12 by the Solicitor General of Canada or the Attorney General, as the case may be, accompanied by an affidavit"

Strike out lines 26 to 31 inclusive on page 6 and substitute the following therefor:

"(ii) pursuant to an order of a judge of a superior court of criminal jurisdiction or a judge as defined in section 482; and

(b) destroyed except pursuant to an order of a judge referred to in subparagraph (a) (ii)."

Strike out lines 37 and 38 on page 6 and substitute the following therefor:

"178.15 (1) Where the Attorney General of a province or the Solicitor General of Canada or an agent specially designated in"

Strike out lines 43 and 44 on page 7 and substitute the following therefor:

"jurisdiction or a judge as defined in section 482 and shall be signed by an agent who would"

Strike out lines 16 and 17 on page 9 and substitute the following therefor:

"been lawfully intercepted shall not be received in"

Amend the French version by striking out line 30 on page 13 and substituting the following therefor:

"vince dans laquelle le procès a eu lieu"

Strike out lines 5 and 6 on page 14 and substitute the following therefor:

"(a) authorizations for which he and agents specially"

Strike out lines 22 and 23 on page 17 and substitute the following therefor:

"(a) authorizations for which he and agents specially"

Clause 3

Strike out lines 44 and 45 on page 17 and substitute the following therefor:

"tion made under subsection 662.1 (1), 663 (1) or 664 (3) or (4)."

Clause 6

Strike out line 18 on page 21 and substitute the following therefor:

"warrant or to any person who in good faith aids in any way a person whom he has reasonable and probable grounds to believe is acting in accordance with a warrant, and does not affect the admissibility of any"

Your Committee has ordered a reprint of Bill C-6, as amended, pursuant to Standing Order 75(2), for the use of the House of Commons at the report stage.

A copy of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence relating to this Bill (*Issues* Nos. 8, 9, 10 and 11) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 29 to the Journals).

A petition was presented by the honourable Member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay).

Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Drury, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-214, An Act to promote agricultural and fishery exhibitions and to provide for the development of multi-purpose community facilities suitable for use in connection with such exhibitions, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure respecting the promotion of agricultural and fishery exhibitions and the development of multi-purpose community facilities suitable for use in connection with such exhibitions; to authorize the making of loans to exhibition corporations in the aggregate amount of one hundred million dollars for the construction, extension or improvement of exhibition facilities; to authorize the making of grants to exhibition corporations for such purposes as are prescribed by regulations and are directly related to agricultural or fishing exhibitions or agricultural or fishery museums; to authorize for the purposes of the Act the use of the personnel, facilities, and services of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation; to provide for the appointment of an advisory committee and for the payment of allowances and expenses to its members; and to provide for matters in connection with the administration of the Act.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following Question was made an Order of the House for a Return.

No. 133—Mr. Coates

1. How many agencies of government have had a name change since June 25, 1968, and in each instance, what was the former name and what is the present name?

2. What has been the cost to the federal treasury of eliminating stationery and other such matters associated with the operation under the former name and what has been the cost of replacing such necessary requirements of these agencies under their new names?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/133.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Return to the foregoing Order.

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 12, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all papers including the Feasibility Study commissioned by

Air Canada in respect to the consolidation of reservation offices of Air Canada in Canada, including estimates as to the savings to be made by the Company, the reduction in staff complement, etc.,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Ordered,—That there be laid before this House copies of all contracts dealing with publicity and/or information entered into by the Department of Labour (including the Unemployment Insurance Commission) in the fiscal years 1970-71 and 1971-72.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 50—Mr. Nystrom*).

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That speeches on the motion under the order Business of Supply be limited to fifteen minutes with the exception of the mover and the principal speaker on behalf of the government who shall be limited to twenty minutes.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Baldwin, seconded by Mr. Bell, moved,—This House, conscious of the failure of the Government to keep the Canadian people and Parliament adequately informed, urges that steps be taken by legislation and otherwise to provide clear rules for freedom of information with regard to public business.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the motion expired.

A message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendments Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act, without any amendment.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Knight for Mr. Saltzman on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. Deakon, Cyr, Stafford, Corriveau, Smith (Saint-Jean), Lambert (Edmonton West) and Barnett for Messrs. Whiting, Osler, LeBlanc (Rimouski), Loisel, Crossman, Thomas (Moncton) and Blackburn on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Whelan for Mr. McNulty on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley) for Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Munro, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Report on the Administration of Allowances for Disabled Persons in Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 12 of the Disabled Persons Act, chapter D-6, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/121.

By Mr. Munro, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Report on the Administration of Old Age Assistance in Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 12 of the Old Age Assistance Act, chapter O-5, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/203.

By Mr. Munro, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Report on the Administration of Allowances for Blind Persons in Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 12 of the Blind Persons Act, chapter B-7, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/73.

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow, at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 74

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk of the House had laid upon the Table the Fifth Report of the Clerk of Petitions, which is as follows:

The Clerk of Petitions has the honour to report that he has examined the petition of Lew. De Mone and other persons resident in the Eastern Shore area of the Province of Nova Scotia, in relation to the road transport in the region of the Eastern Shore and in particular from Port Bickerton to Country Harbour, presented by Mr. Elmer MacKay, Member of Parliament, on Wednesday, June 14, 1972, and finds that the petition meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

Mr. Speaker communicated to the House the following letter:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
OTTAWA

15 June 1972

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Roland A. Ritchie, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 15th day

of June, at 5.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,

ESMOND BUTLER,
Secretary to the Governor General.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That speeches on the motion under the order Business of Supply be limited to fifteen minutes with the exception of the mover and the principal speaker on behalf of the government who shall be limited to twenty minutes.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Dionne, seconded by Mr. Caouette, moved,—That this House deplores the fact that the Government has not adopted the appropriate measures for involving workers in Canadian firms

through profit-sharing and stock purchase programs as a means of promoting social stability, reinforcing our country's economy and ensuring greater co-operation between capital and labour.

And debate arising thereon;

A Message was received from the Honourable Mr. Justice Roland A. Ritchie, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, desiring the immediate attendance of the House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went to the Senate Chamber.

And being returned;

Mr. Speaker reported that, when the House did attend the Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, His Honour was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bill:

Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Criminal Code 1967 Amendment Act, the Criminal Records Act, the National Defence Act, the Parole Act and the Visiting Forces Act. —Chapter No. 13.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Dionne, seconded by Mr. Caouette,—That this House deplores the fact that the Government has not adopted the appropriate measures for involving workers in Canadian firms through profit-sharing and stock purchase programs as a means of promoting social stability, reinforcing our country's economy and ensuring greater co-operation between capital and labour.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the motion expired.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

By unanimous consent at 9.54 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Badanai, Osler, McNulty and LeBlanc (Rimouski) for Messrs. Corriveau, Whelan, Deakon and Smith (Saint-Jean) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. McBride for Mr. Trudel on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Comtois for Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo) on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mrs. MacInnis for Mr. Brewin on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Messrs. Beer, L'Heureux, La Salle, Barrett, Loiseleur and Breau for Messrs. McNulty, Stafford, Turner (London East), Osler, Cyr and Weatherhead on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Smith (Saint-Jean), Legault, Hymmen, Cyr, Turner (London East) and Guay (St. Boniface) for Messrs. Breau, Beer, Caccia, L'Heureux, Badanai and Barrett on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Deakon for Mr. La Salle on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

At 10.20 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 75

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Valade, seconded by Mr. Rock, moved,—This House regrets the Government's continuing refusal to this date to intervene in the impasse between the International Longshoremen's Association and the Maritime Employers' Association despite the short and long term damage to the St. Lawrence seaports, to the users of the national transportation system and to the economic well-being of Canada and despite the sufferings of the longshoremen and their families; and therefore this House, in the public interest, calls upon the Government to intervene forthwith to end the strike.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the motion expired.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Brewin for Mrs. MacInnis on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Allmand for Mr. Breau on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Messrs. Weatherhead, Caccia and McNulty for Messrs. Legault, Hymmen and Smith (Saint-Jean) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Macdonald, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, including its Accounts and Financial Statements for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/62.

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Return to an Order of the House, dated June 14, 1972, for copies of all contracts dealing with publicity and/or information entered into by the Department of Labour (including the Unemployment Insurance Com-

mission) in the fiscal years 1970-71 and 1971-72—(Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 50).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/50.

By unanimous consent, at 4.53 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until Monday, at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 76

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, JUNE 19, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. MacEachen for Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), seconded by Mr. Côté (Longueuil), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-215, An Act to amend the Pension Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to amend the Pension Act to increase the maximum number of commissioners that may be appointed from twelve to fourteen and the maximum number of ad hoc commissioners that may be appointed from five to ten.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following Question was made an Order of the House for a Return.

No. 559—Mr. Godin

During the years 1970 and 1971, did Canada import any lamb or pork and, if so (a) in what quantities of each type (b) from what countries?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/559.

24960—26

Mr. St. Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, presented,—Return to the foregoing Order.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Nystrom, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That this House regrets the failure of the Government to produce a comprehensive and coherent program to deal with the growing unemployment among our young people and its disregard of youth's legitimate aspirations.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the motion expired.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Thomas (Moncton) for Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Fairweather and La Salle for Messrs. Scott and Roy (Laval) on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Statement of Operations under the Civil Service Insurance Act, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to subsection 2 of section 21 of the said Act, chapter 49, R.S.C., 1952. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/110.

At 10.23 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow, at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 77

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Portelance, from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, presented the Fifth Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Tuesday, April 18, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, and has agreed to report it with the following amendments:

Clause 1

Strike out line 16 on page 8 and substitute the following therefor:

"any reason other than his removal from the Board by the Governor in Council pursuant to subsection 111(4) or a reason specified"

Strike out line 29 on page 11 and substitute the following therefor:

"jurisdiction that is before the Board in the proceeding;"

Strike out line 31 on page 12 and substitute the following therefor:

"respecting any matter that is before the Board in the proceeding;"

24960—26½

Strike out lines 1 to 5, both inclusive, on page 20 and substitute the following therefor:

"129. (1) Subject to subsection (2), the Board shall determine the result of a representation vote on the basis of the ballots cast by the majority of employees voting.

(2) Where, on considering the result of a representation vote, the Board determines that less than thirty-five per cent of the employees who are eligible to vote have voted, the Board shall determine that the representation vote is void.

(3) A vote by the majority of the em—"

Strike out lines 6 to 14, both inclusive, on page 31 and substitute the following therefor:

"145. (1) Where the Governor in Council deletes the name of any portion of the public service of Canada specified from time to time in Part I or Part II of Schedule I to the Public Service Staff Relations Act and that portion of the public service of Canada is established as or becomes a part of a corporation to which this Part applies, or where a portion of the public service of Canada included in a portion of the public service of Canada so specified in Part I or Part II of Schedule I to that Act is severed from the

portion in which it was included and established as or becomes a part of a corporation to which this Part applies,"

Strike out line 25 in the French version on page 35 and substitute the following therefor:

"en vertu de ce paragraphe;"

Your Committee has ordered a reprint of Bill C-183, as amended, pursuant to Standing Order 75(2), for the use of the House of Commons at the report stage.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 inclusive*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 30 to the Journals).

Mr. Basford, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Summary Report, dated June, 1972, of the Prices and Incomes Commission, entitled "Inflation, Unemployment and Incomes Policy" (Chairman—John H. Young, Esq.). (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/10.

Mr. Basford, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Press Release, dated June 20, 1972, announcing the building of a promenade around the base of Parliament Hill. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/11.

By unanimous consent, pursuant to Standing Order 43, on motion of Mr. Macquarrie, seconded by Mr. McGrath, it was resolved,—That, whereas the continued testing of nuclear warheads by the nuclear powers adds to the dangers of the nuclear arms race and may seriously pollute the human environment, this Canadian House of Commons again calls on all nuclear powers to cease all testing of nuclear devices and particularly calls on the Government of France to cancel the latest of its tests in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-216, An Act to amend the Regional Development Incentives Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-217, An Act to amend the Regional Development Incentives Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-218, An Act to amend the Industrial Research and Development Incentives Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Hees for Mr. Baldwin, seconded by Mr. Flemming, moved,—This House regrets that the government's expenditures for incentive programs have failed to stimulate production and trade in Canadian goods and services and to open increased opportunities for productive employment to Canadians.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the motion expired.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.01 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Downey, Moore and Yanakis for Messrs. Korchinski, Mazankowski and Buchanan on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Watson, Danson, Osler and Howard (Okanagan Boundary) for Messrs. Goode, Howard (Okanagan Boundary), Lind and Leblanc (Laurier) on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. Corriveau, Badanai, Serré and Morison for Messrs. Deakon, McNulty, Corriveau and Guay (St. Boniface) on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Messrs. Côté (Richelieu), Leblanc (Laurier) and Stewart (Cochrane) for Messrs. Buchanan, McNulty and Loiselle on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Noble for Mr. Schumacher on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Mazankowski for Mr. Noble on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Leblanc (Laurier) for Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary) on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. St. Pierre, Forget and Faulkner for Messrs. Leblanc (Laurier) Whicher and Blair on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Caccia for Mr. Faulkner on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Return to an Order of the House, dated May 17, 1972, for a copy of all papers including correspondence between any Indian band, provincial or national Indian organizations and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and/or any officials in his Department regarding the James Bay Development.—

(*Notice of Motion for the Production Papers No. 57*).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/57.

By Mr. MacEachen,—Return to an Order of the House, dated June 7, 1972, for a copy of the financial statements of the Yukon Native Brotherhood for each fiscal year during which grants have been made to the Brotherhood by any department or agency of the government.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 59*).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/59.

By Mr. Mackasey, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Number and Amount of Loans to Immigrants made under section 65(1) of the Immigration Act for the year ended March 31, 1972 pursuant to section 65(6) of the said Act, chapter I-2, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/159.

At 10.24 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow, at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 78

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Turner (London East) for Mr. Lessard (LaSalle), from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, presented the Fourth Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Friday, May 5, 1972, your Committee held public hearings in South Western Ontario for the purpose of hearing representations on the adequacy of passenger service in that area. During these hearings which were held in London, Chatham, Stratford and Walkerton, Ontario, your Committee received approximately fifty-five briefs and heard from sixty-eight witnesses. In addition, your Committee was presented with petitions, letters and mail-in coupons containing several thousand names asking for restoration or continuance of rail passenger service in the South Western Ontario region.

As a result of hearings by the Canadian Transport Commission held at Owen Sound and Guelph, Ontario, in 1970 six distinct rail passenger services were ordered discontinued effective November 1, 1970. At the time of the discontinuance, the Canadian Transport Commission assumed and the residents of the affected areas were informed that the bus lines in the area could adequately accommodate all public transportation needs. After almost two years the evidence presented to your Com-

mittee indicates that there is widespread dissatisfaction with the type of passenger service offered to the travelling public of South Western Ontario. Your Committee also found that existing bus services in the area do not constitute a satisfactory alternate public transportation service.

Therefore your Committee recommends that all rail passenger services which were discontinued on November 1, 1970, should be re-established immediately and a moratorium should be placed on all pending passenger train discontinuance applications in Canada, until the study referred to hereafter is completed, as recommended in many briefs and particularly in that brief presented by the Government of the Province of Ontario.

Your Committee also recommends that a joint study group composed of representatives of Federal, Provincial, Municipal officials and railway employees be established immediately to determine a minimum rail passenger network as defined in relationship to the most efficient and adequate transportation system making the best use of all modes of transportation at the lowest possible total cost.

Your Committee also recommends that departmental officials concerned with ferry services, river erosion, and

airport upgrading study the problems expressed during the Chatham hearings by municipal officials to determine the feasibility of early and practical solutions to these serious problems.

Your Committee further recommends that the railways be directed to investigate better methods of transporting feeder cattle from Western to Eastern Canada particularly with a view to the upgrading of feeding and watering stations on route and the use of improved cars in which cattle could be fed and watered on the cars.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 10 to 14*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 31 to the Journals*).

Mr. Davis, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—(1) Copy of Text of Canadian proposals accepted unanimously in a Plenary Session of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, dated June 14, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/12A.

(2) Copy of Introductory Statement by the Honourable Jack Davis to the Plenary Session United Nations Conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm, June 5-16, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/12.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That the said documents be printed as an Appendix to this day's *Hansard*.

Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-219, An Act to amend the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce Act (public disclosure), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The Order being read for the introduction of a Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Regional Development Incentives Act".

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: This bill has an explanatory note as follows: "The purpose of this bill is to ensure that the incentive grants under the Regional Development Incentives Act result in permanent benefits to the economy and the people of designated regions rather than benefits to private enterprise."

I think the explanatory note would identify the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable Member for the views he has just expressed. I think he will agree, upon

reflection, that it is not only the increase in the amount approved or recommended by the Royal Recommendation that cannot be changed; there is also a prohibition against a redirection of the amount that is approved or that is recommended to this House in the Royal Recommendation. To my way of thinking, the honourable Member proposes that any moneys committed under the Act are to be redirected in a manner other than that envisaged in the Royal Recommendation which preceded the bill establishing the Regional Development Incentives Act. In addition, I suggest to the House and to the honourable Member in particular that the effect of the proposed bill would be that the government would purchase control of a private firm with public funds. I am not sure whether this second aspect is necessarily true; certainly, there is no doubt in my mind that there would be a redistribution of funds and that this would be contrary to the strict terms of the Royal Recommendation. In the circumstances, I do not think the bill proposed in those specific terms ought to be put to the House.

Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-220, An Act to amend the Regional Development Incentives Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following three Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 351—Mr. Yewchuk

1. For each year 1961 to 1970 inclusive, by province and territory, how many persons speaking (a) an Indian dialect (b) an Eskimo dialect were employed (i) full-time (ii) part-time by CBC radio and television broadcasting industry?

2. For each fiscal year 1969/70 and 1970/71, how many persons speaking (a) an Indian dialect (b) an Eskimo dialect did CBC lay off for want of funds?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/351.

No. 445—Mr. Matte

Have groups or municipalities in the constituency of Champlain submitted projects under the Local Initiatives Programme and, if so (a) what is the nature of each (b) for each of these projects what was (i) the code number (ii) the date of submission (iii) the names of those in charge (iv) the amount of the grant requested (c) which of these projects were accepted?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/445.

No. 573—Mr. Godin

For the year 1971-72, has the Department of Manpower and Immigration entered into contract with employers or companies pursuant to Section 6 of the Adult Occupational Training Act and, if so (a) how many contracts were signed in the Province of Quebec (b) what

were the names and addresses of the contractors (c) in each case, what was the duration of the contract?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/573.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 20, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study on the federal government and the arts undertaken in the fiscal year 1966-67 for the Secretary of State as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the 1st Session of this Parliament,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Resolved,—That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence with the Minister of Public Works relating to the permitted installation and use of a co-axial television cable suspended from the International Bridge between Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick, which cable is purported to be owned by Acadia Cable TV Limited.—(Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 66—Mr. Flemming).

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That speeches on the motion under the order Business of Supply be limited to fifteen minutes with the exception of the mover, the principal speaker on behalf of the government who shall be limited to thirty minutes and the principal speakers of the other opposition parties who shall be limited to twenty minutes.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Stanfield, seconded by Mr. Bell, moved,—This House regrets the failure of the government to proceed during the current session of Parliament with a positive legislative program; and particularly regrets its failure to carry out the program proposed in the Speech from the Throne on February 17th, 1972, and adopted by this House, thus betraying

the trust placed by this House in the ministry to provide adequate measures to meet the needs of Canadians.

After debate thereon, proceedings on the motion expired.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Blair, Leblanc (Laurier), Whicher, Buchanan and Howard (Okanagan Boundary) for Messrs. Caccia, St. Pierre, Forget, Danson and Noël on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. Loiselle and McNulty for Messrs. Côté (Richelieu) and Leblanc (Laurier) on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Messrs. Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay), Legault and Robinson for Messrs. Leblanc (Laurier), Whicher and Blair on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Whicher for Mr. Watson on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Blair for Mr. Legault on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Watson for Mr. Whicher on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Goyer, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copy of Contract entered into between the Government of Canada and the Town of Swan Hills, in the Province of Alberta, pursuant to section 20(3) of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, chapter R-9, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/266B.

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 79

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Kaplan, from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, presented the Fourth Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Tuesday, June 6, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, and has agreed to report it with the following amendments:

Clause 3

Strike out lines 31 to 43 on page 4 and lines 1 to 10 on page 5 and substitute the following:

“(2) Where, in the case of a corporation incorporated in Canada or elsewhere,

(a) shares of the corporation to which are attached

(i) 25% or more of the voting rights ordinarily exercisable at meetings of shareholders of the corporation, in the case of a corporation the shares of which are publicly traded, or

(ii) 40% or more of the voting rights ordinarily exercisable at meetings of shareholders of the corporation, in the case of a corporation the shares of which are not publicly traded,

are owned by one or more individuals described in paragraph (a) of the definition “non-eligible person” in subsection (1), by one or more governments or agencies described in paragraph (b) of that definition or by one or more corporations incorporated elsewhere than in Canada, or any combination of such persons, or

(b) shares of the corporation to which are attached 5% or more of the voting rights ordinarily exercisable at meetings of shareholders of the corporation are owned by any one individual described in paragraph (a) of the definition “non-eligible person” in subsection (1), by any one government or agency described in paragraph (b) of that definition, or by any one corporation incorporated elsewhere than in Canada, the corporation is, unless the contrary is established, a non-eligible person.”

Strike out lines 33 to 43 on page 5 and lines 1 to 7 on page 6 and substitute the following:

“(b) control of a Canadian business enterprise that is a Canadian business carried on by a corporation either alone or jointly or in concert with one or more other persons is not acquired by reason only of

(i) the acquisition by any person or group of persons of shares of the corporation to which are attached

(A) less than 5% of the voting rights ordinarily exercisable at meetings of shareholders of the corporation, in the case of a corporation the shares of which are publicly traded, or

(B) less than 20% of the voting rights ordinarily exercisable at meetings of shareholders of the corporation the shares of which are not publicly traded,

(ii) the acquisition of shares of the corporation by any person in the ordinary course of that person's business as a trader or dealer in securities,

(iii) the acquisition of shares of the corporation by any person in the ordinary course of a business carried on by that person that consists of providing, in Canada, venture capital upon terms and conditions not inconsistent with such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Minister for the purposes of this subparagraph in relation to any such business, or

(iv) the acquisition of control of the corporation by another corporation (in this subparagraph referred to as the "controller"), where it is established that

(A) there is in effect an agreement or arrangement, enforceable according to the terms thereof, under which upon the satisfaction of a condition or the happening of an event that it is reasonable to expect will be satisfied or will happen, the corporation will

(I) cease to be controlled by the controller, and

(II) become controlled by a person or group of persons, with whom or with each of the members of which, as the case may be, the controller is dealing at arm's length, and

(B) the control was acquired for the purpose of safeguarding the rights or interests of the controller in respect of

(I) a loan made by him, the whole or any part of which is outstanding, or

(II) any shares of the corporation that are owned by him and that are, under the agreement or arrangement, to be redeemed by the corporation or purchased by the person or group of persons referred to in subclause (A) (II),

and not for any purpose related to the provisions of this Act;"

Strike out lines 13 to 39 on page 8 and substitute the following:

"(c) a person who has a right under a contract, whether written or oral and whether express or implied, in equity or otherwise, either immediately or in the future and either absolutely or contingently,

(i) to, or to acquire, shares of a corporation, or to control the voting rights attaching to shares of a corporation, or

(ii) to dispose of any property used in carrying on a business,

shall, except where the contract provides that the right is not exercisable until the death of an individual designated therein, be deemed, in any case described in subparagraph (i), to have the same position in relation to the control of the corporation as if he owned the shares, and, in any case described in subparagraph (ii) to have the same position in relation to the control of the business as if he owned the property;

(d) the acquisition of any right described in paragraph (c) shall be deemed to constitute the acquisition of the shares or property to which the right relates except where it is established that the right was acquired for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the person by whom it was acquired in respect of a loan made by him, and not for any purpose related to the provisions of this Act;

(e) the acquisition of a leasehold interest in any property used in carrying on a business shall be deemed to constitute the acquisition of that property;"

Strike out line 9 on page 9 and substitute the following:

"(6) For greater certainty,

(a) the reference in paragraph (c) of the definition "non-eligible person" in subsection (1) to a "group of persons" does not include the aggregation of persons who together own all of the shares of, or all of the shares of a particular class of, any corporation in relation to which the reference is relevant, except where those persons act in concert with one another in any matter or transaction affecting the corporation or its management, ownership or financial affairs;

(b) where no one person or group of persons controls a corporation through the ownership of shares of the corporation or any other corporation, the corporation shall be presumed to be controlled by the group of persons comprising the board of directors or other governing body of the corporation, in the absence of any evidence that the corporation is in fact controlled in some other manner by some other person or group of persons; and

(c) where a corporation is controlled by the board of directors or other governing body of the corporation the members of which body include one or more persons described in paragraph (a) or (b) of the definition "non-eligible person" in subsection (1), if the number of members of that body who are persons so described does not exceed 20% of the total number of members of that body the corporation shall be deemed not to be a corporation described in paragraph (c) of that definition.

(7) For greater certainty, a reference in this Act to the acquisition of any thing includes any acquisition thereof that occurs as a result of more than one transaction or event, whether or not those transactions or events occur or have occurred as or as part of a series of related transactions or events and, subject to any other provision of this Act, whether or not one or more of

those transactions or events occurred before the coming into force of this Act.

(8) Where any question arises under this"

Clause 13

Strike out lines 4 to 16 on page 17 and substitute the following:

"(2) Any information with respect to a person or business obtained by the Minister or an officer or employee of Her Majesty in the course of the administration of this Act may,

(a) on request in writing to the Registrar by or on behalf of the person to which it relates or by or on behalf of the person or group of persons carrying on the business to which it relates, be communicated to any person or authority named in the request, or

(b) for any purpose relating to the administration of this Act, be communicated to a Minister of the Crown in right of any province or to an officer or employee of Her Majesty in right thereof

on such terms and conditions and under such circumstances as are approved by the Minister."

Clause 17

Strike out line 7 on page 22 and substitute the following:

"17. Subject to section 17 of the Statistics Act but notwithstanding any other Act, a"

Your Committee has ordered a reprint of Bill C-201, as amended.

A copy of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence relating to this Bill (*Issues Nos. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 inclusively*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 32 to the Journals*).

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That the annual and supplementary reports of the Canadian Wheat Board for the years 1968-69 and 1969-70 and the annual report for the year 1970-71 be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The Order being read for the consideration of the Business of Supply;

Pursuant to Standing Order 58, Mr. Gauthier, seconded by Mr. Fortin, moved,—That this House regrets the government's responsibility for the deterioration of federal-provincial relations as a result of its uncompromising attitudes and policies, its unilateral decisions and its refusal to meet legitimate needs of Canadian provinces, mainly through not making available to them the funds

required for development, economic expansion and welfare of the population.

And debate arising thereon;

By unanimous consent, after further debate, at 9.55 o'clock p.m., pursuant to section 10 of Standing Order 58, debate was interrupted.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$16,324,000 of the Department of Communications for Communications—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And a point of order having been raised by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair has to rule on the point of order raised by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) in respect of which the honourable Member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) and the honourable Member for York South (Mr. Lewis) have submitted argument. I might deal firstly with the argument of the honourable Member for York South who has just resumed his seat. I think honourable Members will acknowledge that the Chair has a responsibility for carrying out the Standing Orders, the precedents and decisions binding upon the Chair. The honourable Member for York South has argued very well, but with respect I think he has not argued about the responsibilities of the Chair. He has really been arguing that if the Chair rules against him he will have to take certain other action. Of course, under the Standing Orders, that is his right.

I do not have any comment as to whether the Standing Orders and practices are fair and just. My comment is that the Chair must be guided by the Standing Orders, precedents and practices of the House. That is the basis on which I have to make my decision.

The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, who raised the point of order, has argued that with reference to Item No. 1 the notice of opposition in the name of the honourable Member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) should take precedence over the motion in the name of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury). It seems to the Chair that in his argument the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre spelled out the distinctions on which I must base my ruling. He referred to Standing Order 58(4)(a), among others, and I will read that part referred to by the honourable Member: "Twenty-four hours' written notice shall be given of an opposition motion on an allotted day".

I want to emphasize this because it then says: "—or of a notice to oppose any item in the estimates."

With respect, I think one must make this differentiation between a motion and a notice to oppose, because that is made quite clear in the Standing Order to which the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre refers. I would agree with the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre if he could convince me that the notice of opposition standing in the name of the honourable Member for Comox-Alberni is in fact a motion. In my respectful submission it is not a motion, and I think this is clear from the Standing Order to which I have referred. It is a notice of opposition and is not in fact a motion, and that is quite clear from the Standing Order.

The honourable Member referred to page vii of *Routine Proceedings and Orders of the Day*, and we find that the heading there is "Opposed Items in the Estimates". Again referring to Standing Order 58(4) (a), in my respectful submission what the honourable Member for Comox-Alberni has set down is a notice to oppose an item, not a motion.

In conclusion, because I think it would be helpful to go back to the history of the Standing Order, I might refer honourable Members to *House of Commons Journals*, 1968-69 at page 429, being the report of the Special Committee on Procedure of the House, specifically the third report of the said Committee. Then turning to page 431 we find under paragraph (i) the following, and I will take a moment to read this: "The final decisions in relation to the main estimates of each department of government would be held over

until the end of the third supply period so that the opportunity to debate any department would remain open throughout the session. A Member wishing to vote against an estimate would be required to give notice, and motions for the adoption of unopposed estimates could be consolidated into a single question."

Indeed, that is the situation we have before us. The honourable Member for Comox-Alberni has given notice that he would like to oppose a particular item and vote against it. Having given that notice the estimate is put in the form of a motion to the Chamber, at which time honourable Members have the right to vote for or against it.

I make this ruling on what I think is the plain and clear meaning of the Standing Orders. If honourable Members feel that the Standing Orders and our procedures are unfair, of course the remedy remains in the hands of honourable Members. This is not something of which the Chair can take cognizance at this time. Therefore, with regret, I must rule against the point of order of the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre.

And the question being put on the motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$16,324,000 of the Department of Communications for Communications—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 30)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Deachman,	Jerome,	Morison,	Stafford,
Andras,	Deakon,	Kaplan,	Munro,	Stanbury,
Badanai,	De Bané,	Lachance,	O'Connell,	Stewart
Barrett,	Drury,	Lajoie,	Olson,	(Cochrane),
Béchar,	Dubé,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Orange,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Benson,	Dupras,	Humboldt),	Osler,	Kootenay),
Blair,	Duquet,	Langlois,	Otto,	St. Pierre,
Blouin,	Éthier,	Laniel,	Ouellet,	Sulatycky,
Borrie,	Faulkner,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Pepin,	Sullivan,
Boulanger,	Forest,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Portelance,	Thomas
Breau,	Forget,	Lefebvre,	Prud'homme,	(Maisonneuve-
Buchanan,	Foster,	Legault,	Reid,	Rosemont),
Caccia,	Francis,	Lessard	Richard,	Tolmie,
Cafik,	Gendron,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Richardson,	Trudeau,
Cantin,	Gervais,	L'Heureux,	Roberts,	Trudel,
Chappell,	Gibson,	Loiselle,	Robinson,	Turner
Chrétien,	Gillespie,	MacEachen,	Rochon,	(London East),
Clermont,	Gray,	MacGuigan,	Roy (Laval),	Turner (Ottawa-
Cobbe,	Guay	Mackasey,	Serré,	Carleton),
Comtois,	(St. Boniface),	McBride,	Sharp,	Wahn,
Corriveau,	Guilbault,	Mahoney,	Smith	Walker,
Côté (Richelieu),	Haidasz,	Marceau,	(Northumberland-	Watson,
Côté (Longueuil),	Hopkins,	Marchand	Miramichi),	Weatherhead,
Cyr,	Howard (Okanagan	(Langelier),	Smith	Whelan,
Danson,	Boundary),	Marchand	(Saint-Jean),	Whiting—113.
Davis,	Hymmen,	(Kamloops-		
		Cariboo),		

NAYS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Fairweather,	Lambert	McKinley,	Rondeau,
Alexander,	Flemming,	(Bellechasse),	McQuaid,	Rose,
Alkenbrack,	Fortin,	Latulippe,	Mather,	Rowland,
Beaudoin,	Gauthier,	Lewis,	Matte,	Ryan,
Bell,	Gilbert,	Lundrigan,	Mazankowski,	Schumacher,
Benjamin,	Gleave,	MacDonald	Monteith,	Scott,
Blackburn,	Godin,	(Egmont),	Murta,	Simpson,
Brewin,	Grills,	MacInnis (Cape	Nesbitt,	Southam,
Broadbent,	Hales,	Breton-East	Noble,	Stewart
Burton,	Harding,	Richmond),	Nowlan,	(Marquette),
Carter,	Horner,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Orlikow,	Thompson
Crouse,	Howe,	MacKay,	Peddle,	(Red Deer),
Danforth,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacLean,	Peters,	Thomson,
Diefenbaker,	North Centre),	Macquarrie,	Ritchie,	(Battleford-
Dionne,	Knowles (Norfolk-	McCleave,	Rock,	Kindersley),
Douglas,	Haldimand),	McGrath,	Rodrigue,	Valade,
				Woolliams—71.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 10, in the amount of \$10,401,000 of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for Corporate Affairs —Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March

31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 31)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Deachman,	Kaplan,	Morison,	Stafford,
Andras,	Deakon,	Lachance,	Munro,	Stanbury,
Badanai,	De Bané,	Lajoie,	O'Connell,	Stewart
Barrett,	Drury,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Olson,	(Cochrane),
Béchar, d,	Dubé,	Humboldt),	Orange,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Benson,	Dupras,	Langlois,	Osler,	Kootenay),
Blair,	Duquet,	Laniel,	Otto,	St. Pierre,
Blouin,	Éthier,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Ouellet,	Sulatycky,
Borrie,	Faulkner,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Pepin,	Sullivan,
Boulanger,	Forest,	Lefebvre,	Portelance,	Thomas
Breau,	Forget,	Legault,	Prud'homme,	(Maisonneuve-
Buchanan,	Foster,	Lessard	Reid,	Rosemont),
Caccia,	Francis,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Richard,	Tolmie,
Cafik,	Gendron,	L'Heureux,	Richardson,	Trudeau,
Cantin,	Gervais,	Loiselle,	Roberts,	Trudel,
Chappell,	Gibson,	MacEachen,	Robinson,	Turner
Chrétien,	Gillespie,	MacGuigan,	Rochon,	(London East),
Clermont,	Gray,	Mackasey,	Roy (Laval),	Turner (Ottawa-
Cobbe,	Guay (St. Boniface),	McBride,	Serré,	Carleton),
Comtois,	Guilbault,	Mahoney,	Sharp,	Wahn,
Corriveau,	Haidasz,	Marceau,	Smith	Walker,
Côté (Richelieu),	Hopkins,	Marchand	(Northumberland-	Watson,
Côté (Longueuil),	Howard (Okanagan	(Langelier),	Miramichi),	Weatherhead,
Cyr,	Boundary),	Marchand	Smith	Whelan,
Danson,	Hymmen,	(Kamloops-	(Saint-Jean),	Whiting—113.
Davis,	Jerome,	Cariboo),		

NAYS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Beaudoin,	Blackburn,	Burton,	Danforth,
Alexander,	Bell,	Brewin,	Carter,	Diefenbaker,
Alkenbrack,	Benjamin,	Broadbent,	Crouse,	Douglas,

Fairweather, Flemming, Fortin, Gilbert, Gleave, Godin, Grills, Hales, Harding, Harkness, Horner, Howe, Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),	Knowles (Norfolk- Haldimand), Lambert (Bellechasse), Latulippe, Lewis, Lundrigan, MacDonald (Egmont), MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond), MacInnis (Mrs.),	MacKay, MacLean, Macquarrie, McCleave, McGrath, McKinley, McQuaid, Mather, Matte, Mazankowski, Monteith, Murta, Nesbitt,	Noble, Nowlan, Orlikow, Peddle, Peters, Ritchie, Rock, Rodrigue, Rondeau, Rose, Rowland, Ryan, Schumacher,	Scott, Simpson, Southam, Stewart (Marquette), Thompson (Red Deer), Thomson (Battleford- Kindersley), Valade, Woolliams—70.
--	--	--	--	---

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 25, in the amount of \$469,000 of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for Prices and Incomes Commission—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year

ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 32)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand, Andras, Badanai, Barrett, Béchar, d, Benson, Blair, Blouin, Borrie, Boulanger, Breau, Buchanan, Caccia, Cafik, Cantin, Chappell, Clermont, Cobbe, Comtois, Corriveau, Côté (Richelieu), Côté (Longueuil), Cyr, Danson, Davis,	Deachman, Deakon, De Bané, Drury, Dubé, Dupras, Duquet, Éthier, Faulkner, Forest, Forget, Foster, Francis, Gendron, Gervais, Gibson, Gillespie, Gray, Guay (St. Boniface), Guilbault, Haidasz, Hopkins, Howard (Okanagan Boundary),	Hymmen, Jerome, Kaplan, Lachance, Lajoie, Lang (Saskatoon- Humboldt), Langlois, Laniel, Leblanc (Laurier), LeBlanc (Rimouski), Lefebvre, Legault, Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean), L'Heureux, Loiselle, MacEachen, MacGuigan, Mackasey, McBride, Mahoney, Marceau, Marchand (Langelier),	Marchand (Kamloops- Cariboo), Morison, Munro, O'Connell, Olson, Orange, Osler, Otto, Ouellet, Pepin, Portelance, Prud'homme, Reid, Richard, Richardson, Roberts, Robinson, Rochon, Roy (Laval), Serré, Sharp, Smith (Northumberland- Miramichi),	Smith (Saint-Jean), Stafford, Stanbury, Stewart (Cochrane), Stewart (Okanagan- Kootenay), St. Pierre, Sulatycky, Sullivan, Thomas (Maisonneuve- Rosemont), Tolmie, Trudeau, Trudel, Turner (London East), Turner (Ottawa- Carleton), Wahn, Walker, Watson, Weatherhead, Whelan, Whiting—112.
--	---	---	---	--

NAYS

Messrs.

Aiken, Alexander, Alkenbrack, Beaudoin, Bell, Benjamin, Blackburn, Brewin,	Burton, Carter, Crouse, Danforth, Diefenbaker, Douglas, Fairweather, Flemming,	Fortin, Gilbert, Gleave, Godin, Grills, Hales, Harding, Horner,	Howe, Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), Knowles (Norfolk- Haldimand), Latulippe, Lewis, Lundrigan,	MacDonald (Egmont), MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond), MacInnis (Mrs.), MacKay, MacLean,
---	---	--	--	--

Macquarrie,
McCleave,
McGrath,
McKinley,
McQuaid,
Mather,
Mazankowski,

Murta,
Nesbitt,
Noble,
Nowlan,
Orlikow,
Peddle,
Peters,

Ritchie,
Rock,
Rodrigue,
Rondeau,
Rose,
Rowland,
Ryan,

Rynard,
Schumacher,
Scott,
Simpson,
Southam,
Stewart
(Marquette),

Thompson
(Red Deer),
Thomson
(Battleford-
Kindersley),
Valade,
Woolliams—66.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$5,960,000 of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources for Administration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31,

1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 33)

YEAS
Messrs.

Allmand,
Andras,
Badanai,
Barrett,
Béchar, d,
Benson,
Blair,
Blouin,
Borrie,
Boulanger,
Breau,
Buchanan,
Caccia,
Cafik,
Cantin,
Chappell,
Chrétien,
Clermont,
Cobbe,
Comtois,
Corriveau,
Côté (Richelieu),
Côté (Longueuil),
Cyr,
Danson,

Davis,
Deachman,
Deakon,
De Bané,
Drury,
Dubé,
Dupras,
Duquet,
Éthier,
Faulkner,
Forest,
Forget,
Foster,
Francis,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gibson,
Gillespie,
Gray,
Guay (St. Boniface),
Guilbault,
Haidasz,
Hopkins,
Howard (Okanagan
Boundary),

Hymmen,
Kaplan,
Lachance,
Lajoie,
Lang (Saskatoon-
Humboldt),
Langlois,
Laniel,
Leblanc (Laurier),
LeBlanc (Rimouski),
Lefebvre,
Legault,
Lessard
(Lac-Saint-Jean),
L'Heureux,
Loiselle,
MacEachen,
MacGuigan,
Mackasey,
McBride,
Mahoney,
Marceau,
Marchand
(Langelier),
Marchand
(Kamloops-
Cariboo),

Morison,
Munro,
O'Connell,
Olson,
Orange,
Osler,
Otto,
Ouellet,
Pepin,
Portelance,
Prud'homme,
Reid,
Richard,
Richardson,
Roberts,
Robinson,
Rochon,
Roy (Laval),
Serré,
Sharp,
Smith
(Northumberland-
Miramichi),
Smith
(Saint-Jean),

Stafford,
Stanbury,
Stewart
(Cochrane),
Stewart (Okanagan-
Kootenay),
St. Pierre,
Sulatycky,
Sullivan,
Thomas
(Maisonneuve-
Rosemont),
Tolmie,
Trudeau,
Trudel,
Turner
(London East),
Turner (Ottawa-
Carleton),
Wahn,
Walker,
Watson,
Weatherhead,
Whelan,
Whiting—112.

NAYS
Messrs.

Aiken,
Alexander,
Alkenbrack,
Beaudoin,
Bell,
Benjamin,
Blackburn,
Brewin,
Broadbent,
Burton,
Carter,
Crouse,
Danforth,
Diefenbaker,
Douglas,
Fairweather,

Flemming,
Fortin,
Gilbert,
Gleave,
Godin,
Grills,
Hales,
Harding,
Howe,
Knowles (Winnipeg
North Centre),
Knowles (Norfolk-
Haldimand),
Lambert
(Bellechasse),

Latulippe,
Lewis,
Lundrigan,
MacDonald
(Egmont),
MacInnis (Cape
Breton-East
Richmond),
MacInnis (Mrs.),
MacKay,
MacLean,
Macquarrie,
McCleave,
McGrath,
McKinley,

McQuaid,
Mather,
Mazankowski,
Murta,
Nesbitt,
Noble,
Nowlan,
Orlikow,
Peddle,
Peters,
Ritchie,
Rock,
Rodrigue,
Rondeau,
Rose,

Rowland,
Ryan,
Scott,
Simpson,
Southam,
Stewart
(Marquette),
Thompson
(Red Deer),
Thomson
(Battleford-
Kindersley),
Valade,
Woolliams—65.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$35,557,000 of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources for Mineral and Energy Resources—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year end—

ing March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 34)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Deakon,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Munro,	Stanbury,
Andras,	De Bané,	Humboldt),	O'Connell,	Stewart
Badanai,	Drury,	Langlois,	Olson,	(Cochrane),
Barrett,	Dubé,	Laniel,	Orange,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Béchar, d,	Dupras,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Osler,	Kootenay),
Benson,	Duquet,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Otto,	St. Pierre,
Blair,	Éthier,	Lefebvre,	Ouellet,	Sulatycky,
Blouin,	Faulkner,	Legault,	Pepin,	Sullivan,
Borrie,	Forest,	Lessard	Portelance,	Thomas
Boulanger,	Forget,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Prud'homme,	(Maisonneuve-
Breau,	Foster,	L'Heureux,	Reid,	Rosemont),
Buchanan,	Francis,	Loiselle,	Richard,	Tolmie,
Caccia,	Gendron,	Macdonald	Richardson,	Trudeau,
Cafik,	Gervais,	(Rosedale),	Roberts,	Trudel,
Cantin,	Gibson,	MacEachen,	Robinson,	Turner
Chappell,	Gillespie,	MacGuigan,	Rochon,	(London East),
Chrétien,	Guay (St. Boniface),	Mackasey,	Roy (Timmins),	Turner (Ottawa-
Clermont,	Guilbault,	McBride,	Roy (Laval),	Carleton),
Cobbe,	Haidasz,	Mahoney,	Serré,	Wahn,
Comtois,	Hopkins,	Marceau,	Sharp,	Walker,
Corriveau,	Howard (Okanagan	Marchand	Smith	Watson,
Côté (Richelieu),	Boundary),	(Langelier),	(Northumberland-	Weatherhead,
Côté (Longueuil),	Hymmen,	Marchand	Miramichi),	Whelan,
Cyr,	Kaplan,	(Kamloops-	Smith	Whiting—112.
Danson,	Lachance,	Cariboo),	(Saint-Jean),	
Deachman,	Lajoie,	Morison,	Stafford,	

NAYS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Fairweather,	MacDonald	Murta,	Rynard,
Alexander,	Fortin,	(Egmont),	Nesbitt,	Schumacher,
Alkenbrack,	Gilbert,	MacInnis (Cape	Noble,	Scott,
Beaudoin,	Gleave,	Breton-East	Nowlan,	Simpson,
Bell,	Godin,	Richmond),	Orlikow,	Southam,
Benjamin,	Grills,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Peddle,	Stewart
Blackburn,	Hales,	MacKay,	Peters,	(Marquette),
Brewin,	Harding,	MacLean,	Ritchie,	Thompson
Broadbent,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Macquarrie,	Rock,	(Red Deer),
Burton,	North Centre),	McCleave,	Rodrigue,	Thomson
Carter,	Knowles (Norfolk-	McGrath,	Rondeau,	(Battleford-
Crouse,	Haldimand),	McKinley,	Rose,	Kindersley),
Danforth,	Latulippe,	McQuaid,	Rowland,	Valade,
Diefenbaker,	Lewis,	Mather,	Ryan,	Woolliams—64.
Douglas,	Lundrigan,	Mazankowski,		

Midnight

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 15, in the amount of \$29,269,000 of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources for Earth Sciences—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31,

1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 35)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Deachman,	Lachance,	Marchand	Smith (Saint-Jean),
Andras,	Deakon,	Lajoie,	(Kamloops-	Stafford,
Badanai,	De Bané,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Cariboo),	Stanbury,
Barrett,	Drury,	Humboldt),	Morison,	Stewart (Cochrane),
Bécharde,	Dubé,	Langlois,	Munro,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Benson,	Dupras,	Laniel,	O'Connell,	Kootenay),
Blair,	Duquet,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Olson,	St. Pierre,
Blouin,	Éthier,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Orange,	Sulatycky,
Borrie,	Faulkner,	Lefebvre,	Osler,	Sullivan,
Boulanger,	Forest,	Legault,	Ouellet,	Thomas
Breau,	Forget,	Lessard	Pepin,	(Maisonneuve-
Buchanan,	Foster,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Portelance,	Rosemont),
Caccia,	Francis,	L'Heureux,	Prud'homme,	Tolmie,
Cafik,	Gendron,	Loiselle,	Reid,	Trudeau,
Cantin,	Gervais,	Macdonald	Richard,	Trudel,
Chappell,	Gibson,	(Rosdale),	Richardson,	Turner (London
Chrétien,	Gillespie,	MacEachen,	Roberts,	East),
Clermont,	Guay (St. Boniface),	MacGuigan,	Robinson,	Turner (Ottawa-
Cobbe,	Guilbault,	Mackasey,	Rochon,	Carleton),
Comtois,	Haidasz,	McBride,	Roy (Timmins),	Wahn,
Corriveau,	Hopkins,	Mahoney,	Roy (Laval),	Walker,
Côté (Richelieu),	Howard (Okanagan	Marceau,	Serré,	Watson,
Côté (Longueuil),	Boundary),	Marchand	Sharp,	Weatherhead,
Cyr,	Hymmen,	(Langelier),	Smith	Whelan,
Danson,	Kaplan		(Northumberland-	Whiting—111.
			Miramichi),	

NAYS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Fairweather,	Lewis,	Mather,	Ryan,
Alexander,	Fortin,	Lundrigan,	Mazankowski,	Rynard,
Alkenbrack,	Gilbert,	MacDonald	Murta,	Schumacher,
Beaudoin,	Gleave,	(Egmont),	Nesbitt,	Scott,
Bell,	Godin,	MacInnis	Noble,	Simpson,
Benjamin,	Grills,	(Cape Breton-	Nowlan,	Southam,
Blackburn,	Hales,	East Richmond),	Orlikow,	Stewart
Brewin,	Harding,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Peddle,	(Marquette),
Broadbent,	Harkness,	MacKay,	Peters,	Thompson
Burton,	Howe,	MacLean,	Ritchie,	(Red Deer),
Carter,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Macquarrie,	Rock,	Thomson (Battleford-
Crouse,	North Centre),	McCleave,	Rodrigue,	Kindersley),
Danforth,	Knowles (Norfolk-	McGrath,	Rondeau,	Valade,
Diefenbaker,	Haldimand),	McKinley,	Rose,	Woolliams—66.
Douglas,	Latulippe,	McQuaid,	Rowland,	

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$11,550,000 of the Department of the Environment for Administration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973

(less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 36)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Bécharde,	Borrie,	Caccia,	Chrétien,
Andras,	Benson,	Boulanger,	Cafik,	Clermont,
Badanai,	Blair,	Breau,	Cantin,	Cobbe,
Barrett,	Blouin,	Buchanan,	Chappell,	Corriveau,

Côté (Richelieu),	Guay (St. Boniface),	L'Heureux,	Ouellet,	Stewart
Côté (Longueuil),	Guilbault,	Loiselle,	Pepin,	(Cochrane),
Cyr,	Haidasz,	Macdonald	Portelance,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Danson,	Hopkins,	(Rosedale),	Prud'homme,	Kootenay),
Deachman,	Howard (Okanagan	MacEachen,	Reid,	St. Pierre,
Deakon,	Boundary),	MacGuigan,	Richard,	Sulatycky,
De Bané,	Hymmen,	Mackasey,	Richardson,	Sullivan,
Drury,	Jerome,	McBride,	Roberts,	Thomas
Dubé,	Kaplan,	Mahoney,	Robinson,	(Maisonneuve-
Dupras,	Lachance,	Marceau,	Rochon,	Rosemont),
Duquet,	Lajoie,	Marchand	Roy (Timmins),	Tolmie,
Éthier,	Lang (Saskatoon-	(Langelier),	Roy (Laval),	Trudel,
Faulkner,	Humboldt),	Marchand	Serré,	Turner
Forest,	Langlois,	(Kamloops-	Sharp,	(London East),
Forget,	Laniel,	Cariboo),	Smith	Turner (Ottawa-
Foster,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Morison,	(Northumberland-	Carleton),
Francis,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Munro,	Miramichi),	Wahn,
Gendron,	Lefebvre,	O'Connell,	Smith	Walker,
Gervais,	Legault,	Olson,	(Saint-Jean),	Watson,
Gibson,	Lessard	Orange,	Stafford,	Weatherhead,
Gillespie,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Osler,		Whelan,
				Whiting—109.

NAYS
Messrs.

Aiken,	Fairweather,	Lundrigan,	Mazankowski,	Ryan,
Alexander,	Fortin,	MacDonald	Murta,	Rynard,
Alkenbrack,	Gilbert,	(Egmont),	Nesbitt,	Schumacher,
Beaudoin,	Gleave,	MacInnis (Cape	Noble,	Scott,
Bell,	Godin,	Breton-East	Nowlan,	Simpson,
Benjamin,	Grills,	Richmond),	Orlikow,	Southam,
Blackburn,	Hales,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Peddle,	Stewart
Brewin,	Harding,	MacKay,	Peters,	(Marquette),
Broadbent,	Harkness,	MacLean,	Ritchie,	Thompson
Burton,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Macquarrie,	Rock,	(Red Deer),
Carter,	North Centre),	McCleave,	Rodrigue,	Thomson
Crouse,	Knowles (Norfolk-	McGrath,	Rondeau,	(Battleford-
Danforth,	Haldimand),	McKinley,	Rose,	Kindersley),
Diefenbaker,	Latulippe,	McQuaid,	Rowland,	Valade,
Douglas,	Lewis,	Mather,		Woolliams—65.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$90,868,286 of the Department of the Environment for Environmental Quality—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$79,506,000 of the Department of External Affairs for International Affairs—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 37)

YEAS
Messrs.

Andras	Blouin,	Cafik,	Comtois,	Deachman,
Badanai,	Borrie,	Cantin,	Corriveau,	Deakon,
Barrett,	Boulanger,	Chappell,	Côté (Richelieu),	De Bané,
Bécharde,	Breau,	Chrétien,	Côté (Longueuil),	Drury,
Benson,	Buchanan,	Clermont,	Cyr,	Dupras,
Blair,	Caccia,	Cobbe,	Danson,	Duquet,

Éthier,	Lachance,	Mahoney,	Roberts,	St. Pierre,
Faulkner,	Lajoie,	Marceau,	Robinson,	Sulatycky,
Forest,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Marchand	Rochon,	Sullivan,
Forget,	Humboldt),	(Langelier),	Roy (Timmins),	Thomas
Foster,	Laniel,	Marchand	Roy (Laval),	(Maisonneuve-
Francis,	Leblanc (Laurier),	(Kamloops-	Serré,	Rosemont),
Gendron,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Cariboo),	Sharp,	Tolmie,
Gervais,	Lefebvre,	Morison,	Smith	Trudel,
Gibson,	Legault,	Munro,	(Northumberland-	Turner
Gillespie,	Lessard	O'Connell,	Miramichi),	(London East),
Guay (St. Boniface),	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Orange,	Smith	Turner (Ottawa-
Guilbault,	L'Heureux,	Osler,	(Saint-Jean),	Carleton),
Haidasz,	Loiselle,	Ouellet,	Stafford,	Wahn,
Hopkins,	Macdonald	Pepin,	Stanbury,	Walker,
Howard (Okanagan	(Rosedale),	Portelance,	Stewart	Watson,
Boundary),	MacEachen,	Prud'homme,	(Cochrane),	Weatherhead,
Hymmen,	MacGuigan,	Reid,	Stewart (Okanagan-	Whelan,
Jerome,	Mackasey,	Richard,	Kootenay),	Whiting—107.
Kaplan,	McBride,	Richardson,		

NAYS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Fairweather,	Lundrigan,	Mazankowski,	Schumacher,
Alexander,	Fortin,	MacDonald	Murta,	Scott,
Beaudoin,	Gleave,	(Egmont),	Nowlan,	Simpson,
Bell,	Godin,	MacInnis (Cape	Orlikow,	Southam,
Benjamin,	Hales,	Breton-East	Peddle,	Stewart
Blackburn,	Harding,	Richmond),	Peters,	(Marquette),
Brewin,	Harkness,	MacKay,	Ritchie,	Thompson
Broadbent,	Howe,	MacLean,	Rock,	(Red Deer),
Burton,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Macquarrie,	Rodrigue,	Thomson
Carter,	North Centre),	McCleave,	Rondeau,	(Battleford-
Crouse,	Lambert	McGrath,	Rose,	Kindersley),
Danforth,	(Bellechasse),	McKinley,	Rowland,	Valade,
Diefenbaker,	Latulippe,	McQuaid,	Ryan,	Woolliams—60.
Douglas,	Lewis,	Mather,	Rynard,	

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 25, in the amount of \$11,691,000 of the Department of External Affairs for the Canadian International Development Agency—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal

year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 38)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Cafik,	Deakon,	Gibson,	Lang (Saskatoon-
Andras,	Cantin,	De Bané,	Gillespie,	Humboldt),
Badanai,	Chappell,	Drury,	Guay (St. Boniface),	Langlois,
Barrett,	Chrétien,	Dupras,	Guilbault,	Laniel,
Bécharde,	Clermont,	Duquet,	Haidasz,	Leblanc (Laurier),
Benson,	Cobbe,	Éthier,	Hopkins,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),
Blair,	Comtois,	Faulkner,	Howard (Okanagan	Lefebvre,
Blouin,	Corriveau,	Forest,	Boundary),	Legault,
Borrie,	Côté (Richelieu),	Forget,	Hymmen,	Lessard
Boulanger,	Côté (Longueuil),	Foster,	Jerome	(Lac-Saint-Jean),
Breau,	Cyr,	Francis,	Kaplan,	L'Heureux,
Buchanan,	Danson,	Gendron,	Lachance,	Loiselle,
Caccia,	Deachman,	Gervais,	Lajoie,	

Macdonald (Rosedale),	Morison,	Richardson,	Stafford,	Trudel,
MacEachen,	Munro,	Roberts,	Stanbury,	Turner (London
MacGuigan,	O'Connell,	Robinson,	Stewart (Cochrane),	East),
Mackasey,	Olson,	Rochon,	Stewart (Okanagan-	Turner (Ottawa-
McBride,	Orange,	Roy (Timmins),	Kootenay),	Carleton),
Mahoney,	Osler,	Roy (Laval),	St. Pierre,	Wahn,
Marceau,	Ouellet,	Serré,	Sulatycky,	Walker,
Marchand	Pepin,	Sharp,	Sullivan,	Watson,
(Langelier),	Portelance,	Smith	Thomas	Weatherhead,
Marchand	Prud'homme,	(Northumberland-	(Maisonneuve-	Whelan,
(Kamloops-	Reid,	Miramichi),	Rosemont),	Whiting—110.
Cariboo),	Richard,	Smith (Saint-Jean),	Tolmie,	

NAYS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Fairweather,	Lewis,	Mazankowski,	Ryan,
Alexander,	Fortin,	MacDonald	Murta,	Rynard,
Alkenbrack,	Gilbert,	(Egmont),	Nesbitt,	Schumacher,
Beaudoin,	Gleave,	MacInnis (Cape	Noble,	Scott,
Bell,	Godin,	Breton-East	Nowlan,	Simpson,
Benjamin,	Grills,	Richmond),	Orlikow,	Southam,
Blackburn,	Harding,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Peddle,	Stewart (Marquette),
Brewin,	Harkness,	MacKay,	Peters,	Thompson (Red
Broadbent,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacLean,	Ritchie,	Deer),
Burton,	North Centre),	Macquarrie,	Rock,	Thomson (Battleford-
Carter,	Knowles (Norfolk-	McCleave,	Rodrigue,	Kindersley),
Crouse,	Haldimand),	McGrath,	Rondeau,	Valade,
Danforth,	Lambert	McKinley,	Rose,	Woolliams—64.
Diefenbaker,	(Bellechasse),	McQuaid,	Rowland,	
Douglas,	Latulippe,	Mather,		

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$8,673,000 of the Department of Finance for Financial and Economic Policies—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 10, in the amount of \$246,000 of the Department of Finance for Anti-Dumping Tribunal—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 20, in the amount of \$761,000 of the Department of Finance for Insurance—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 25, in the amount of \$441,000 of the Department of Finance for Tariff Board—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$11,161,800 of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for Administration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$227,338,000 of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for Indian and Eskimo Affairs—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 20, in the amount of \$25,584,000 of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for Northern Development—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 65, in the amount of \$27,598,900 of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for Conservation—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$44,812,000 of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for Trade—Industrial—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 20, in the amount of \$16,156,000 of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for Tourism—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 25, in the amount of \$1,880,000 of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for Grains and Oilseeds—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 45, in the amount of \$55,464,000 of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for Statistics Canada—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31,

1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$15,907,000 of the Department of Justice for Justice—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$15,222,000 of the Department of Manpower and Immigration for Administration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$244,519,000 of the Department of Manpower and Immigration for Development and Utilization of Manpower—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 15, in the amount of \$27,205,000 of the Department of Manpower and Immigration for Immigration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 20, in the amount of \$7,346,000 of the Department of Manpower and Immigration for Program Development Service—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$7,758,000 of the Department of National Defence for Administration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$1,448,216,000 of the Department of National Defence for Canadian Armed Forces—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 39)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Deakon,	Laniel,	Mazankowski,	Smith
Alexander,	De Bané,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Morison,	(Saint-Jean),
Alkenbrack,	Diefenbaker,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Munro,	Stafford,
Allmand,	Drury,	Lefebvre,	Murta,	Stanbury,
Andras,	Dupras,	Legault,	Nowlan,	Stewart
Badanai,	Duquet,	Lessard	O'Connell,	(Marquette),
Barrett,	Éthier,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Olson,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Béchar, d,	Fairweather,	L'Heureux,	Orange,	Kootenay),
Bell,	Faulkner,	Loiselle,	Osler,	St. Pierre,
Benson,	Forest,	MacDonald	Ouellet,	Sulatycky,
Blair,	Forget,	(Egmont),	Peddle,	Sullivan,
Blouin,	Foster,	Macdonald	Pepin,	Thomas
Borrie,	Francis,	(Rosedale),	Portelance,	(Maisonneuve-
Boulanger,	Gendron,	MacEachen,	Prud'homme,	Rosemont),
Breau,	Gervais,	MacGuigan,	Reid,	Thompson,
Buchanan,	Gibson,	MacInnis (Cape	Richard,	(Red Deer),
Caccia,	Gillespie,	Breton-East	Ritchie,	Tolmie,
Cafik,	Grills,	Richmond),	Roberts,	Trudel,
Cantin,	Guay (St. Boniface),	MacKay,	Robinson,	Turner
Carter,	Guilbault,	MacLean,	Rochon,	(London East),
Chappell,	Haidasz,	Macquarrie,	Rock,	Turner (Ottawa-
Chrétien,	Harkness,	McBride,	Roy (Timmins),	Carleton),
Clermont,	Hopkins,	McCleave,	Roy (Laval),	Valade,
Cobbe,	Howard (Okanagan	McGrath,	Ryan,	Wahn,
Comtois,	Boundary),	McKinley,	Schumacher,	Walker,
Corriveau,	Hymmen,	McQuaid,	Scott,	Watson,
Côté (Richelieu),	Jerome,	Mahoney,	Serré,	Weatherhead,
Côté (Longueuil),	Kaplan,	Marceau,	Sharp,	Whelan,
Crouse,	Lachance,	Marchand	Simpson,	Whiting,
Cyr,	Lajoie,	(Langelier),	Smith,	Woolliams—141.
Danforth,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Marchand	(Northumberland-	
Danson,	Humboldt),	(Kamloops-	Miramichi),	
Deachman,	Langlois,	Cariboo),		

NAYS

Messrs.

Beaudoin,	Fortin,	Lambert	Orlikow,	Thomson
Benjamin,	Gilbert,	(Bellechasse),	Peters,	(Battleford-
Blackburn,	Gleave,	Latulippe,	Rodrigue,	Kindersley)—23.
Broadbent,	Harding,	Lewis,	Rondeau,	
Burton,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Rose,	
Douglas,	North Centre),	Mather,	Rowland,	

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 30, in the amount of \$5,075,000 of the Department of National Defence for Civil Emergency Measures —Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March

31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 35, in the amount of \$3,042,000 of the Department of National Defence for Defence Construction (1951) Limited—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$7,758,000 of the Department of National Health and Welfare for Administration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$4,698,000 of the Department of National Health and Welfare for Non-Medical Use of Drugs—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 10, in the amount of \$3,575,000 of the Department of National Health and Welfare for Health Insurance and Resources—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 20, in the amount of \$51,538,000 of the Department of National Health and Welfare for Medical Services—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 25, in the amount of \$25,883,000 of the Department of National Health and Welfare for Health Protection—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 35, in the amount of \$18,973,000 of the Department of National Health and Welfare for Income Security and Social Assistance—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 45, in the amount of \$1,149,000 of the Department of National Health and Welfare for Fitness and Amateur Sport—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 50, in the amount of \$540,000 of the Department of National Health and Welfare for Medical Research Council—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$95,210,000 of the Department of National Revenue for Customs and Excise—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$121,110,000 of the Department of National Revenue for Taxation—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$3,923,470 of Parliament for the Senate—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 40)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,	Diefenbaker,	Laniel,	Mazankowski,	Smith
Alexander,	Drury,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Morison,	(Saint-Jean),
Alkenbrack,	Dupras,	LeBlanc (Rimouski),	Munro,	Stafford,
Allmand,	Duquet,	Lefebvre,	Murta,	Stanbury,
Andras,	Éthier,	Legault,	Nowlan,	Stewart
Badanai,	Fairweather,	Lessard	O'Connell,	(Marquette),
Barrett,	Faulkner,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Olson,	Stewart (Okanagan-
Bécharde,	Forest,	L'Heureux,	Orange,	Kootenay),
Bell,	Forget,	Loiselle,	Osler,	St. Pierre,
Benson,	Foster,	MacDonald	Ouellet,	Sulatycky,
Blair,	Francis,	(Egmont),	Peddle,	Sullivan,
Blouin,	Gendron,	Macdonald	Pepin,	Thomas
Borrie,	Gervais,	(Rosedale),	Portelance,	(Maisonneuve-
Boulanger,	Gibson,	MacEachen,	Prud'homme,	Rosemont),
Breau,	Gillespie,	MacGuigan,	Reid,	Thompson
Buchanan,	Grills,	MacInnis (Cape	Richard,	(Red Deer),
Caccia,	Guay	Breton-East	Richardson,	Tolmie,
Cafik,	(St. Boniface),	Richmond),	Ritchie,	Trudel,
Cantin,	Guilbault,	MacKay,	Roberts,	Turner
Carter,	Haidasz,	MacLean,	Robinson,	(London East),
Chappell,	Harkness,	Macquarrie,	Rochon,	Turner (Ottawa-
Chrétien,	Hopkins,	McBride,	Rock,	Carleton),
Clermont,	Howard (Okanagan	McCleave,	Roy (Timmins),	Valade,
Cobbe,	Boundary),	McGrath,	Roy (Laval),	Wahn,
Comtois,	Howe,	McKinley,	Ryan,	Walker,
Corriveau,	Hymmen,	McQuaid,	Schumacher,	Watson,
Côté (Richelieu),	Jerome,	Mahoney,	Scott,	Weatherhead,
Côté (Longueuil),	Kaplan,	Marceau,	Serré,	Whiting,
Crouse,	Lachance,	Marchand	Sharp,	Woolliams—141.
Cyr,	Lajoie,	(Langelier),	Simpson,	
Danforth,	Lang (Saskatoon-	Marchand	Smith	
Danson,	Humboldt),	(Kamloops-	(Northumberland-	
Deachman,	Langlois,	Cariboo),	Miramichi),	
De Bané,				

NAYS

Messrs.

Beaudoin,	Douglas,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Rose,
Benjamin,	Fortin,	North Centre),	Mather,	Rowland,
Blackburn,	Gilbert,	Lambert	Orlikow,	Thomson
Broadbent,	Gleave,	(Bellechasse),	Peters,	(Battleford-
Burton,	Godin,	Latulippe,	Rodrigue,	Kindersley),
Deakon,	Harding,	Lewis,	Rondeau,	Whelan—26.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$18,147,000 of Parliament for the House of Commons—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$449,302,000 of the Post Office

Department for Post Office—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 15, in the amount of \$1,280,000 of the Privy Council for Commissioner of Official Languages—Program Ex-

penditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 20, in the amount of \$2,700,000 of the Privy Council for Economic Council of Canada—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 25, in the amount of \$1,871,000 of the Privy Council for Public Service Staff Relations Board—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$14,792,000 of the Department of Public Works for Administration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 10, in the amount of \$154,006,000 of the Department of Public Works for Accommodation—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 15, in the amount of \$130,000,000 of the Department of Public Works for Accommodation—Capital Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 20, in the amount of \$11,232,000 of the Department of Public Works for Marine—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973

(less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 25, in the amount of \$13,592,000 of the Department of Public Works for Marine—Capital Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 35, in the amount of \$8,992,000 of the Department of Public Works for Transportation and Other Engineering—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 40, in the amount of \$8,159,000 of the Department of Public Works for Transportation and Other Engineering—Capital Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$34,230,700 of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 10, in the amount of \$382,741,400 of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for Regional Economic Expansion—Grants and Contributions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$1,402,000 of the Department of Science and Technology for Science Council of Can-

ada—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$3,585,000 of the Department of the Secretary of State for Administration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$1,679,000 of the Department of the Secretary of State for Bilingualism Development—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 15, in the amount of \$4,173,000 of the Department of the Secretary of State for Arts and Culture—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 25, in the amount of \$14,981,000 of the Department of the Secretary of State for Translation—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 40, in the amount of \$2,167,000 of the Department of the Secretary of State for Citizenship Registration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 60, in the amount of \$4,822,000 of the Department of the Secretary of State for Canadian Radio-Television Commission—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year

ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 85, in the amount of \$5,498,000 of the Department of the Secretary of State for National Library—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 90, in the amount of \$17,734,000 of the Department of the Secretary of State for National Museums of Canada—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 95, in the amount of \$5,639,000 of the Department of the Secretary of State for Public Archives—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 105, in the amount of \$21,985,000 of the Department of the Secretary of State for Public Service Commission—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$2,082,000 of the Department of the Solicitor General for Administration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$73,684,000 of the Department of the Solicitor General for Correctional Services—Penitentiary Service—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 20, in the amount of \$143,773,000 of the Department of the Solicitor General for Law Enforcement—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$4,662,000 of the Department of Supply and Services for Administration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$24,281,000 of the Department of Supply and Services for Supply—Program Ex-

penditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 10, in the amount of \$46,273,000 of the Department of Supply and Services for Services—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 25, in the amount of \$10,354,000 of the Department of Supply and Services for Information Canada—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 41)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand,
Andras,
Badanai,
Barrett,
Béchar, d,
Benson,
Blair,
Blouin,
Borrie,
Breau,
Buchanan,
Caccia,
Cafk,
Cantin,
Chappell,
Chrétien,
Clermont,
Cobbe,
Comtois,
Corriveau,
Côté (Richelieu),
Côté (Longueuil).
Cyr,
Danson,
Deachman,
Deakon,
De Bané,
Drury,
Dupras,
Duquet,
Éthier,
Faulkner,
Forest,
Forget,
Foster,
Francis,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gibson,
Gillespie,
Guay (St. Boniface),
Guilbault,
Haidasz,
Hopkins,
Howard (Okanagan Boundary),
Hymmen,
Jerome,
Kaplan,
Lachance,

Lajoie,
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt),
Langlois,
Laniel,
Leblanc (Laurier),
LeBlanc (Rimouski),
Lefebvre,
Legault,
Lessard
(Lac-Saint-Jean),
L'Heureux,
Loiselle,
Macdonald
(Rosedale),
MacEachen,
MacGuigan,
McBride,
Mahoney,
Marceau,
Marchand
(Langelier),
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo),

Morison,
Munro,
O'Connell,
Olson,
Orange,
Osler,
Ouellet,
Pepin,
Portelance,
Prud'homme,
Reid,
Richard,
Richardson,
Roberts,
Robinson,
Rochon,
Roy (Timmins),
Roy (Laval),
Serré,
Sharp,
Smith
(Northumberland-Miramichi),
Smith
(Saint-Jean),

Stafford,
Stanbury,
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay),
St. Pierre,
Sulatycky,
Sullivan,
Thomas
(Maisonneuve-Rosemont),
Tolmie,
Trudel,
Turner
(London East),
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton),
Wahn,
Walker,
Watson,
Weatherhead,
Whelan,
Whiting—107.

NAYS

Messrs.

Aiken,
Alexander,
Alkenbrack,
Beaudoin,
Bell,
Benjamin,

Blackburn,
Broadbent,
Burton,

Carter,
Crouse,
Danforth,

Diefenbaker,
Douglas
Fairweather,

Fortin,	Latulippe,	McCleave,	Peters,	Simpson,
Gilbert,	Lewis,	McGrath,	Ritchie,	Stewart
Godin,	MacDonald (Egmont),	McKinley,	Rock,	(Marquette),
Grills,	MacInnis (Cape	McQuaid,	Rodrigue,	Thompson
Harding,	Breton-East Rich-	Mather,	Rondeau,	(Red Deer),
Harkness,	mond),	Mazankowski,	Rose,	Thomson
Howe,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Murta,	Rowland,	(Battleford-
Knowles (Winnipeg	MacKay,	Nowlan,	Ryan,	Kindersley),
North Centre),	MacLean,	Orlikow,	Schumacher,	Valade,
Lambert	Macquarrie,	Peddle,	Scott,	Woolliams—58.
(Bellechasse),				

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$9,228,000 of the Department of Transport for Headquarters—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 5, in the amount of \$86,940,000 of the Department of Transport for Marine Transportation—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 10, in the amount of \$39,752,000 of the Department of Transport for Marine Transportation—Capital Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 20, in the amount of \$120,616,000 of the Department of Transport for Air Transportation—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 25, in the amount of \$47,913,000 of the Department of Transport for Air Transportation—Capital Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 40, in the amount of \$39,961,000 of the Department of Transport for Surface Transportation—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 55, in the amount of \$3,868,000 of the Department of Transport for Transportation Development Agency—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 75, in the amount of \$11,596,000 of the Department of Transport for the Canadian Transport Commission—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$13,027,000 of the Treasury Board for Central Administration of the Public Service—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 25, in the amount of \$54,708,000 of the Treasury Board for National Research Council of Canada—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$9,543,000 of the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs for Urban Affairs—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 20, in the amount of \$12,050,000 of the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs for National Capital Commission—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 1, in the amount of \$5,281,000 of the Department of Veterans Affairs for Administration—Program Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Vote 45, in the amount of \$68,386,000 of the Department of Veterans Affairs for Treatment Service—Operating Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, except those Votes concurred in earlier this day, and less amounts voted in Interim Supply, be concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Bill C-221, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1973, be now read a first time and be printed.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment and concurred in at the report stage, on division.

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Mazankowski, Korchinski and Moore for Messrs. Ritchie, Moore and Danforth on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Rowland, Deakon, Portelance, Reid and Hopkins for Messrs. Knight, Robinson, Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay), Deakon and Osler on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. Langlois and Lefebvre for Messrs. La Salle and Isabelle on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Danforth for Mr. McKinley on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Deakon, Serré, McKinley and Cyr for Messrs. Yanakis, Whicher, Moore and La Salle on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Messrs. Turner (London East) and Lajoie for Messrs. Whicher and Cullen on the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Messrs. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond), Gibson and Reid for Messrs. Lambert (Edmonton West), Badanai and Legault on the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Benson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Statement on the Standing and Transactions

of the Canadian Forces Superannuation Account as at March 31, 1972, together with a Statement of Annuities, Annual Allowances, Cash Termination Allowances, and Return of Contributions for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 28 of the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act, chapter C-9, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/92.

By Mr. Benson,—Statement on the Standing and Transactions of the Regular Forces Death Benefit Account for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 41 of the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act, chapter C-9, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/226.

By Mr. Benson,—Statement of Moneys received and disbursed in the Special Account (Replacement of Materiel) for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pur-

suant to section 11(4) of the National Defence Act, chapter N-4, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/185.

By Mr. Goyer, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copy of Contract entered into between the Government of Canada and the Town of Raymond, in the Province of Alberta, pursuant to section 20(3) of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, chapter R-9, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/266C.

At 3.05 o'clock a.m., on motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Pepin, the House adjourned on division, until 11.00 o'clock a.m., this day pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 80

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Beer, from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Wednesday, May 10, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, and has agreed to report it without amendment.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 16 to 23, inclusive*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 33 to the Journals*).

A petition was presented by the honourable Member for St. John's West (Mr. Carter).

Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—(1) Copy of Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation. Done at Montreal, September 23, 1971. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/50.

(2) Copy of Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft. Signed at the Hague, December 16, 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/51.

On motion of Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt) for Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson, it was ordered,—That, on June 26, 27 and 29, 1972 the hours of sitting shall be:

11.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m.

2.00 p.m. to 6.00 p.m.

8.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m.

Provided that Routine Proceedings shall be taken up at 2.00 p.m. and that Government Orders shall be taken up between 11.00 a.m. and 1.00 p.m.

Pursuant to Standing Order 60(2), Mr. Mahoney, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, designated Monday, June 26, 1972, for the consideration of Ways and Means motions.

The Order being read for resuming consideration of the report stage of Bill C-204, An Act to amend the Canadian

Wheat Board Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

A point of order having been raised at a previous sitting with respect to the regularity of a proposed motion;

By unanimous consent, Mr. Gleave, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That Bill C-204, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, be amended

(a) by deleting from Clause 5 lines 29 to 37 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"5. Section 35 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"35. (1) The Governor in Council may by regulation extend the application of Part III or Part IV or of both Parts III and IV to any or all of oats, barley, rye, flax seed or rapeseed or to all of them.

(2) Where the Governor in Council has extended the application of any Part under subsection (1), the provisions of that Part shall be deemed to be re-enacted in this Part, except that

(a) the word "oats", "barley", "rye", "flax seed" or "rapeseed", as the case may be, shall be substituted for the word "wheat";

(b) the expression "oat products", "barley products", "rye products", "flax seed products" or "rapeseed products", as the case may be, shall be substituted for the expression "wheat products";

(c) the sum certain per bushel to be fixed by the Governor in Council in respect of oats, barley, rye, flax seed or rapeseed may be so fixed basis in storage either Thunder Bay or Vancouver or only Thunder Bay or only Vancouver; and"

(b) by adding immediately after line 5 at page 5 the following:

"(3) The Governor in Council shall make any regulation extending the application of Part III or IV or of both Parts III and IV to any of rye, flax seed or rapeseed after considering the possibility of holding a plebiscite of the producers in consultation with the appropriate representatives of such organizations with co-operative or direct membership that are involved in the marketing or production of these three grains."

(c) by renumbering subsequent subsections accordingly.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.

Mr. Pepin for Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Mahoney, moved,—That Bill C-204, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, be amended by adding, immediately after line 13 on page 9, the following clause:

"7.1 Section 46 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

Coming into force "46. Sections 13, 14 and 15 shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation."

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Mr. Pepin for Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Mahoney, moved,—That Bill C-204, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, be amended by striking out lines 19 and 20 on page 9 and substituting the following:

Coming into force "9. (1) This Act, except section 7.1, shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Idem (2) Section 7.1 shall be deemed to have come into force on July 15, 1971."

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

And the House having reverted to the deferred division on the motion of Mr. Gleave, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-204, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, be amended

(a) by deleting from Clause 5 lines 29 to 37 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"5. Section 35 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"35. (1) The Governor in Council may by regulation extend the application of Part III or Part IV or of both Parts III and IV to any or all of oats, barley, rye, flax seed or rapeseed or to all of them.

(2) Where the Governor in Council has extended the application of any Part under subsection (1), the provisions of that Part shall be deemed to be re-enacted in this Part, except that

(a) the word "oats", "barley", "rye", "flax seed" or "rapeseed", as the case may be, shall be substituted for the word "wheat";

(b) the expression "oat products", "barley products", "rye products", "flax seed products" or "rapeseed products", as the case may be, shall be substituted for the expression "wheat products";

(c) the sum certain per bushel to be fixed by the Governor in Council in respect of oats, barley, rye, flax seed or rapeseed may be so fixed basis in storage either Thunder Bay or Vancouver or only Thunder Bay or only Vancouver; and"

(b) by adding immediately after line 5 at page 5 the following:

"(3) The Governor in Council shall make any regulation extending the application of Part III or IV or of

both Parts III and IV to any of rye, flax seed or rape-seed after considering the possibility of holding a plebiscite of the producers in consultation with the appropriate representatives of such organizations with co-operative or direct membership that are involved

in the marketing or production of these three grains." (c) by renumbering subsequent subsections accordingly.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 42)

YEAS
Messrs.

Benjamin,
Broadbent,
Burton,
Gilbert,

Gleave,
Harding,
Knowles (Winnipeg
North Centre,

Latulippe,
Lewis,
MacInnis (Mrs.),
Mather,

Matte,
Orlikow,
Rondeau,
Rose,

Rowland,
Thomson
(Battleford-
Kindersley),
Winch—18.

NAYS
Messrs.

Alkenbrack,
Allmand,
Badanai,
Baldwin,
Barrett,
Béchar,
Bell,
Blouin,
Boulanger,
Breau,
Buchanan,
Cantin,
Clermont,
Cyr,
Deachman,
Diefenbaker,
Drury,
Dupras,
Éthier,
Forget,

Foster,
Francis,
Gibson,
Gillespie,
Guay (St. Boniface),
Guilbault,
Gundlock,
Harkness,
Hopkins,
Howard (Okanagan
Boundary),
Isabelle,
Kaplan,
Korchinski,
Lachance,
Lang (Saskatoon-
Humboldt),
Langlois,
Lefebvre,
Legault,

Lessard
(Lac-Saint-Jean),
L'Heureux,
Loiselle,
Lundrigan,
Macdonald
(Rosedale),
MacGuigan,
MacInnis (Cape
Breton-East
Richmond),
Mackasey,
McBride,
McGrath,
McIntosh,
McKinley,
McNulty,
Mahoney,
Marceau,
Marshall,

Monteith,
Munro,
Murta,
Orange,
Osler,
Peddle,
Pepin,
Richard,
Richardson,
Roberts,
Roy (Laval),
Rynard,
Schumacher,
Serré,
Sharp,
Simpson,
Smith
(Northumberland-
Miramichi),

Smith
(Saint-Jean),
Southam,
Stewart
(Cochrane),
Stewart (Marquette),
St. Pierre,
Sulatycky,
Thompson
(Red Deer),
Trudeau,
Turner
(London East),
Turner (Ottawa-
Carleton),
Wahn,
Walker,
Woolliams—84.

On motion of Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Pepin, the said bill, as amended, was concurred in at the report stage.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Pepin, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

By unanimous consent, the hour for Private Members' Business was suspended.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs of Bill C-215, An Act to amend the Pension Act.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) for Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), seconded by Mr. Pepin, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

The Order being read for the report stage of Bill C-195, An Act to amend the Adult Occupational Training Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mrs. MacInnis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That Bill C-195, An Act to amend the Adult Occupational Training Act, be amended in Clause 1 by changing the period at the end of line 10

at page 1 to a comma, and by adding immediately there-after the following words:

"including a woman who is engaged in the domestic services of her home whether or not she has at any time been a member of the labour force."

And debate arising thereon;

By unanimous consent, Mrs. MacInnis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved in amendment thereto,—That all the words after the word "including" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"a person who is engaged in the domestic service at home whether or not such person has at any time been a member of the labour force."

And the question being put on the said amendment, it was agreed to.

And the question being put on the said motion, as amended, it was agreed to and is as follows:

Mrs. MacInnis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That Bill C-195, An Act to amend the Adult Occupational Training Act, be amended in Clause 1 by changing the period at the end of line 10 at page 1 to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"including a person who is engaged in the domestic service at home whether or not such person has at any time been a member of the labour force."

On motion of Mr. Mackasey, seconded by Mr. Mahoney, the said bill, as amended, was concurred in at the report stage.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Mackasey, seconded by Mr. Mahoney, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Jamieson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Financial Statements of the National Harbours Board, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 32 of the National Harbours Board Act, chapter N-8, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/154.

By Mr. Marchand, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on the Operation of the Regional Development Incentives Act for the period May 1 to May 31, 1972, pursuant to section 16 of the said Act, chapter R-3, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/325B.

By Mr. Munro, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on the Administration of the Canada Assistance Plan for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1970, pursuant to section 19 of the Canada Assistance Plan Act, chapter C-1, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/77.

At 5.00 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until Monday, at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to order made Friday, June 23, 1972.

No. 81

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, JUNE 26, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: My understanding is that the House is to proceed this morning with consideration of the motions respecting Bill C-201. Perhaps the Chair might make some brief observations in relation to proposed or suggested groupings of some of these motions. I do not expect that all of them will be disposed of this morning, so that there will be opportunities during the hours and perhaps days ahead to review possible groupings of these different motions, but in any event after looking at these motions over the weekend the Chair would like to suggest that motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 21 and 28 be combined for the purpose of debate and that a division on motion No. 1 would dispose of the other four motions also. These motions appear to relate to the same matter. I think it would be difficult to have different debates on each one of these motions. I would think that one debate could very well cover the field of discussion in relation to Nos. 1, 2, 3, 21 and 28.

The next step would be motions Nos. 4 and 18 which could be combined for the purpose of debate, and a division on motion No. 4 would also dispose of motion No. 18.

Then motions Nos. 5 to 9 inclusive might also be combined for the purpose of debate. Motion No. 5 might be

disposed of separately. A division on Motion No. 6 would also dispose of motions Nos. 7, 8 and 9. I do not think I should attempt to cover the whole field at this time, but perhaps I should at this point refer to motion No. 9. The printed version of this motion is incorrect. The corrected version should be as follows: "That Bill C-201, an Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended as follows: in subparagraph 3(3)(c) by substituting the figure 10 per cent for the figure 5 per cent in line 34; and in line 39 by substituting the figure 40 per cent for the figure 20 per cent."

Perhaps we might leave it at that for the moment and review the matter later after we have disposed of some of the motions to which I have alluded. Further groupings might be considered by honourable Members in the meantime.

— — — — —

Mr. SPEAKER: My understanding is that the reprinted bill is included in the files that honourable Members have on their desks at the present time. Perhaps we might deal only with the first one of the groupings which I think is quite obvious to any honourable Member. This would give honourable Members an opportunity to think of the other groupings to which I have referred. In other

words, I think there should be no objection that Nos. 1, 2, 3, 21 and 28 be combined in this debate and be the subject of one division.

— — — — —

Mr. SPEAKER: A memorandum will be circulated among House Leaders in order that honourable Members who might be interested will suggest further groupings in advance. These will be proposed from the Chair in due course but it might give honourable Members a chance to look at the different motions to see whether the groupings suggested by the Chair are logical and acceptable to honourable Members.

— — — — —

The Order being read for the report stage of Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs;

Mr. Saltsman, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting the following words after the word “economic” in subsection (1) of Clause 2 on line 13 on page 1:

“, political and social”.

Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting the following words after the word “Canada” in subsection (1) of Clause 2 on line 1 on page 2:

“and is likely to enhance the ability of Canadians to maintain effective control over their economic environment”.

Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting therein, immediately preceding paragraph (a) of subsection (2) of Clause 2 on page 2 the following:

“(a) the likelihood that the acquisition will enhance the ability of Canadians to maintain effective control over their economic environment;”

and by renumbering the subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting the following words after the word

“Canada” in Clause 9, subsection (1) on line 44 of page 17:

“and is likely to enhance the ability of Canadians to maintain effective control over their economic environment”.

Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting the following words after the word “Canada” in subsection (6) of Clause 18 on lines 20 and 21 on page 27:

“and is likely to enhance the ability of Canadians to maintain effective control over their economic environment.”.

After debate thereon, pursuant to Special Order made Friday, June 23, 1972, the said debate was interrupted.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk of the House had laid upon the Table the Sixth Report of the Clerk of Petitions, which is as follows:

The Clerk of Petitions has the honour to report that he has examined the petition of Ron Pumphrey and other persons resident in the Province of Newfoundland, in relation to railway passenger service in Newfoundland, presented by Mr. Walter Carter, Member of Parliament, on Friday, June 23, 1972, and finds that the petition meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

Mr. Foster, from the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, presented the Third Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Monday, May 8, 1972, your Committee has heard evidence concerning disability pensions of members of the Armed Forces who were prisoners of war.

Your Committee held 4 meetings on this subject from May 16, 1972, to June 22, 1972, and heard the following witnesses:

1. *From the National Prisoners of War Association:* Mr. Douglas A. Dunn, President; Mr. Edward J. Musgrove, Vice-President; Mr. Tom McDermott, Secretary; Mr. H. C. Chadderton, Liaison Officer.

2. *From the Dieppe Veterans and Prisoners of War Association:* Mr. Albert Brown, Dominion President.

3. *From the Hong Kong Veterans Association of Canada:* Mr. C. P. Brady, National President; Mr. J. Stroud, National 1st Vice-President; Mr. M. D'Avignon, President, Quebec and Maritimes Branch; Mr. R. Sellers, 1st Vice-President, Winnipeg Branch.

4. *From the Department of Veterans Affairs:* Dr. J. S. Hodgson, Deputy Minister; Dr. K. S. Ritchie, Assistant

Deputy Minister (Hospitals); Dr. W. J. F. Young, Deputy Director General, Treatment Services.

5. *From the Canadian Pension Commission:* Mr. A. O. Solomon, Chairman; Mr. J. M. Forman, Deputy Chairman; Dr. H. J. Richardson, Chief Medical Advisor; Dr. C. N. Brebner, Deputy Chief Medical Advisor.

Your Committee has heard briefs from the Hong Kong Veterans Association of Canada and a joint brief presented by the National Prisoners of War Association and the Dieppe Veterans and Prisoners of War Association. Testimony was also heard from officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Canadian Pension Commission. Dr. Albert Haas, an expert witness for the Hong Kong Veterans Association, although unable to be present for a committee hearing, did send a written submission supporting testimony of this Association.

The Committee was impressed when reminded by the testimony given of the very difficult and often brutal hardships imposed on former prisoners of war in enemy camps. It was apparent from the testimony that the physical and psychological impact of this maltreatment was not all felt immediately but has continued to affect these Canadians to this day and will in the years ahead.

The Committee is conscious of the need to see justice done to our veterans in absolute terms, and also to strike a balance in compensation for disability or incapacity between groups who contributed to the defence of our Nation in different theatres of war and in various ways.

In hearing the testimony, the Committee was conscious of the fact that the full impact of the amendments to the Pension Act, enacted in 1971, has not been established yet. The "Benefit of the Doubt" section, for example, although applied to many cases by the Canadian Pension Commission, has not yet been appealed to the new Pension Review Board which will make the final determination as to how this section is to be interpreted.

The Hong Kong Veterans Association of Canada has requested that their members, who are unable to work or hold a job, receive a 100% pension. The Hong Kong group associated the difficulties in getting and keeping a job with disabilities resulting from maltreatment in prisoner of war camps.

The Committee is reluctant to recommend a statutory change to resolve this problem because of the distortion it would make to the principle of the Pension Act. The principle of the Pension Act is that veterans receive a pension as a matter of right, in direct proportion to war-related injuries or disabilities. This principle was altered in the case of the Pacific Theatre prisoners of war to an across-the-board pension of 50% by the 1971 amendments. These amendments have resulted in an automatic increase in pension for some 332 veterans in the past year and will guarantee a pension to their widows and dependents.

The Hong Kong Veterans Association has asked that heart disease, arthritis and premature aging be established as diseases related to war service. The testimony given

by the expert witnesses would indicate that these conditions were aggravated by avitaminosis and prison camp conditions, but these were not the primary causes. To establish these diseases by statute without responsible medical evidence would set a dangerous precedent. The Committee believes that justice can be done in these cases by the "Benefit of the Doubt" provision rather than by establishing by statute the cause of a disease which has not yet been established by medical evidence.

The National Prisoners of War Association and the Dieppe Veterans and Prisoners of War Association have requested in general terms that former prisoners of war from the European Theatre be eligible to apply for an automatic pension of 10% if the veteran was imprisoned for 1 year and 50% for those imprisoned for 2 years or more, to compensate for maltreatment and disability resulting from incarceration.

Some consideration has already been shown for these veterans by the special Orders in Council passed by the Government in the 1950's making maltreatment awards to certain veterans who were former prisoners of war. These awards were made from war reparation funds. Therefore these veterans are already identified as a group and numbered 6,731 at the time of payment in the 1950's. These veterans were prisoners of the Gestapo, the SS, the SD or the Leadership Corps, or could qualify for maltreatment awards through the Sumner Test.

The Committee is conscious of the need to see equitable treatment given to former prisoners of war of the European Theatre vis-à-vis the Pacific Theatre, especially in light of the 1971 amendments to the Pension Act giving the Hong Kong group an automatic 50% pension to all who applied for it.

These provisions to former Hong Kong prisoners of war were based on medical evidence contained in a study carried out by Dr. H. J. Richardson, Chief Medical Advisor to the Canadian Pension Commission. From the testimony presented, the Committee is concerned with the long-term effects that incarceration has had on both the physical and mental health of veterans. Psychological disorders are more difficult to diagnose than physical ones. However, the impact on the veteran's ability to get ahead in his job and even to hold on to it is just as great, if not greater. The Committee is concerned that these problems may be increasing as former prisoners of war reach later stages of middle age and physical strength declines, while at the same time the pressures to compete with younger men for positions and jobs increase. The Committee was advised that psychological conditions are now more often recognized as being related to service experience.

The testimony given to the Committee by officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs seems to indicate that, so far, no one disease has been identified which the Canadian Pension Commission could automatically relate to Canadian prisoners of war who were imprisoned in Europe. We feel this could only be proven conclusively by a proper medical study such as was carried out by Dr. Richardson on the Hong Kong group. The Committee is concerned with the length of time a proper medical

study would take and what effect this would have on delaying the implementation of new legislation for former prisoners of war in the European Theatre. However, it was indicated during the Committee hearings that a proper study could be carried out in a six-month period.

We commend the associations who presented their briefs for their efforts in gathering and tabulating information on prisoners of war. These efforts have been most useful in bringing their case before the Committee.

Recommendation No. 1

The Committee believes that, if the "Benefit of the Doubt" section of the Pension Act is interpreted in a broad way and the way that Parliament intended it to be, many of the problems experienced by prisoners of war in securing adequate pensions would be satisfactorily resolved. Without reservation, the Committee recommends that this section be interpreted broadly.

Recommendation No. 2

The Committee recommends that a continuing review of the medical literature from around the world be maintained by the medical advisors to the Canadian Pension Commission. If the weight of medical evidence indicates that any disease can be identified as primarily caused by prisoner of war conditions, it should be so recognized by the Canadian Pension Commission.

Recommendation No. 3

The Committee strongly urges the Government to commence forthwith a thorough study on the former European prisoners of war, similar to the Richardson study on the Hong Kong prisoners of war, to identify the adverse effects that incarceration has had, and is continuing to have, on these veterans. Every effort should be made to complete the study as soon as possible in view of the urgency of the situation.

Recommendation No. 4

The Committee recommends that the age requirements for former prisoners of war who were incarcerated for one year or more be removed from the War Veterans Allowance Act. The effect of this recommendation would be to provide War Veterans Allowance benefits to former prisoners of war, regardless of age or the theatre of war in which they served, who find that because of deprivation and hardships suffered, they are unable to secure or hold continuous employment.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 5, 7, 8 and 9*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 34 to the Journals*).

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following four Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 182—Mr. Forrestall

By department, has the government any plans to expand office and other floor space either through ownership or leasing in the constituency of Dartmouth-Halifax East in any of the next three years and, if so (a) for what purpose (b) at what annual cost?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/182.

No. 361—Mr. Macquarrie

1. What requests have been received from the Government of Prince Edward Island for the construction of a carageen extraction plant in that Province?

2. What has been the response to such requests, if any, from the Government of P.E.I.?

3. For the past ten years, what is the contribution of the Government of Canada to the Irish moss industry in P.E.I.?

4. For the past ten years, what has been the annual value of Irish moss harvested in P.E.I.?

5. To what countries and in what amounts to each country was this harvest sent for final processing?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/361.

No. 464—Mr. Rodrigue

1. How many paper plants are there in Canada and where are they located?

2. Since 1968, has the government paid any subsidies for (a) the expansion (b) the operation of paper mills in Canada?

3. How many plants have closed down (a) completely (b) partially?

4. How many workers have been laid off by paper mills in Canada since 1968 because (a) the plant was closed (b) production had diminished?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/464.

No. 618—Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse)

Does the Contagious Diseases Division of the Health of Animals Branch of the Department of Agriculture have several offices in Quebec and, if so (a) where are they located (b) which area is under the jurisdiction of each office (c) who is the officer in charge of each office (d) what are the qualifications required of a primary products inspector in charge of applying regulations in force under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/618.

Mr. Béchard, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

The Order being read for the consideration of a Ways and Means Motion to amend the Income Tax Act (Sessional Paper No. 284-1/309), laid upon the Table, Monday, May 8, 1972.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Drury, moved,—That the said motion be now concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

The Order being read for the consideration of a Ways and Means Motion to amend the Income Tax Application Rules, 1971 (Sessional Paper No. 284-1/310), laid upon the Table, Monday, May 8, 1972.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Drury, moved,—That the said motion be now concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

The Order being read for the consideration of a Ways and Means Motion to amend the Excise Tax Act (Sessional Paper No. 284-1/311), laid upon the Table, Monday, May 8, 1972.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Drury, moved,—That the said motion be now concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

The Order being read for the consideration of a Ways and Means Motion to amend Part IV of Chapter 63 of the Statutes of 1970-71-72 (Sessional Paper No. 284-1/312), laid upon the Table, Monday, May 8, 1972.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) seconded by Mr. Drury, moved,—That the said motion be now concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

The Order being read for the consideration of a Ways and Means Motion respecting Customs Tariff (Sessional Paper No. 284-1/313), laid upon the Table, Monday, May 8, 1972.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Drury, moved,—That the said motion be now concurred in.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Pursuant to Standing Order 60(11), on motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Drury, Bill C-222, An Act to amend the statute law relating to income tax, was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Pursuant to Standing Order 60(11), on motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Drury, Bill C-223, An Act to amend the Excise Tax Act, was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Pursuant to Standing Order 60(11), on motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Drury, Bill C-224, An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Consideration was resumed at the report stage of Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Saltzman, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting the following words after the word "economic" in subsection (1) of Clause 2 on line 13 on page 1:

“, political and social”.

And on the motion of Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting the following words after the word “Canada” in subsection (1) of Clause 2 on line 1 on page 2:

“and is likely to enhance the ability of Canadians to maintain effective control over their economic environment”.

And on the motion of Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting therein, immediately preceding paragraph (a) of subsection (2) of Clause 2 on page 2 the following:

“(a) the likelihood that the acquisition will enhance the ability of Canadians to maintain effective control over their economic environment;”

and by renumbering the subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

And on the motion of Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting the following words after the word “Canada” in Clause 9, subsection (1) on line 44 of page 17:

“and is likely to enhance the ability of Canadians to maintain effective control over their economic environment”.

And on the motion of Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201,

An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting the following words after the word "Canada" in subsection (6) of Clause 18 on lines 20 and 21 on page 27:

"and is likely to enhance the ability of Canadians to maintain effective control over their economic environment."

And debate continuing;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to *Standing Order 15 (4)*]

(Notices of Motions)

Mr. Lundrigan, seconded by Mr. MacKay, moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the Government of Canada should consider the advisability of taking the initiative in securing the collaboration of the provinces in the convening of a national conference on uniform standards in primary and secondary education.—(Notice of Motion No. 10.)

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for *Private Members' Business* expired.

Consideration was resumed at the report stage of Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Saltzman, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting the following words after the word "economic" in subsection (1) of Clause 2 on line 13 on page 1:

“, political and social”.

And on the motion of Mr. Burton, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting the following words after the word "Canada" in subsection (1) of Clause 2 on line 1 on page 2:

"and is likely to enhance the ability of Canadians to maintain effective control over their economic environment”.

And on the motion of Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201,

An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting therein, immediately preceding paragraph (a) of subsection (2) of Clause 2 on page 2 the following:

"(a) the likelihood that the acquisition will enhance the ability of Canadians to maintain effective control over their economic environment”;

and by renumbering the subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

And on the motion of Mr. Knight, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting the following words after the word "Canada" in Clause 9, subsection (1) on line 44 of page 17:

"and is likely to enhance the ability of Canadians to maintain effective control over their economic environment”.

And on the motion of Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting the following words after the word "Canada" in subsection (6) of Clause 18 on lines 20 and 21 on page 27:

"and is likely to enhance the ability of Canadians to maintain effective control over their economic environment”.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motions, pursuant to section 11 of *Standing Order 75*, a recorded division was deferred.

Mr. Fairweather, seconded by Mr. Hales, moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting lines 24 to 27 on page 2 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

“dustries in Canada;

(e) the compatibility of the acquisition with national industrial and economic policies; and

(f) after consultation by the Minister with each province that is likely to be significantly affected by an assessment made by him pursuant to section 6, the effect of the acquisition on the industrial and economic policies of each such province.”

Mr. Saltzman, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of

control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by renumbering present Clause 6 as Clause "6(1)" and adding the following immediately thereafter:

"(2) In conducting a review the Minister shall consult with the appointed representative of the province or provinces concerned with the proposed acquisition."

And debate arising thereon;

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.01 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Saltsman for Mr. Rowland on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Messrs. Cullen, Legault and Badanai for Messrs. Gibson, Lajoie and Reid on the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Isabelle for Mr. Lefebvre on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

At 10.24 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Order made on Friday, June 23, 1972.

No. 82

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

The Order being read for the report stage of Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, as reported (with an amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs;

Mr. Marshall, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, moved,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by deleting the definition of "parent" in subclause 2(1), lines 16 to 18 on page 2, and substituting the following:

"parent" in relation to a child means an individual who has, in fact, the custody and control of the child and, where a family relationship exists, means for the purpose of paragraph 5(1)(a) the female parent except in any case where the female parent may be considered disqualified by reason of infirmity, ill health, improvidence or other reasonable cause or in any case where other special circumstances or reasonable cause of any kind may so require."

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived, on division.

Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Mahoney, moved,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits

in respect of children, be amended by striking out lines 7 to 10 on page 3 and substituting the following:

"(i) by a department or agency of the government of Canada or of a province that, by order of any court or by the consent of the parents of that person, has the custody and control of that person, or".

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Mr. Marshall, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, moved,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by deleting subclause 3(4), lines 1 to 4 on page 4.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.

Mr. Marshall, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, moved,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by deleting from subclause 5(1) lines 26 to 31 on page 5, and substituting the following:

"(1.1) Benefits paid in respect of children and persons referred to in subsection 3(1) shall be applied

exclusively toward the maintenance, care, training, education or advancement of the children or persons in respect of whom they were paid."

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived, on division.

By unanimous consent, motion numbered 5 standing in the name of Mr. Marshall as follows:—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by deleting subclause 6(2), lines 14 to 30 on page 6, and substituting the following:

"(2) The amount of a benefit that is payable in respect of a person referred to in paragraph 3(1)(b) in respect of any benefit year is the amount set out in paragraph (1)(a) or (b), as the case may be."

was dropped.

Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Mahoney, moved,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by striking out lines 18 to 30 of Clause 6 at page 6 and substituting the following:

"(1)(a) or (b), as the case may be."

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons that Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, now before the House, be amended by striking out lines 18 to 30 of Clause 6 on page 6 and substituting the following:

"(1)(a) or (b), as the case may be."

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Motion No. 7, as follows:—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by inserting therein, immediately preceding Clause 20 on page 21, the following:

"20. Where an application has been approved in respect of the benefit year commencing September 1, 1972, a benefit is payable, subject to subsection 4(2), for each of the four months immediately preceding that benefit year as if those four months were part of that benefit year."

and by renumbering subsequent clauses accordingly.

RULING BY MR. ACTING SPEAKER

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Laniel): We should now proceed to the consideration of motion No. 7 but, as previously mentioned, the Chair has reservations as to the procedural acceptability of it. If honourable Members will look at the motion and at the bill, they will notice that in clause 2(1) on page 1 of the bill "benefit year" means any period after August, 1972, consisting of 12 consecutive months commencing with the first day of

September. Motion No. 7 proposes to add a new clause No. 20, which would have the effect of suspending the provision relating to a benefit as defined in the bill and provide for payment for a period in advance of the defined benefit year. It is the conclusion of the Chair that this would have the effect of initiating payments in certain cases four months prior to the date which is provided for in the bill and in the recommendation. To my mind this represents a clear financial implication which could not be undertaken without a recommendation. Because of this the motion cannot now be considered.

Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Gillespie, moved,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by striking out lines 10 to 26 of Clause 23 at page 24 and substituting the following:

"(a) the aggregate of

(i) the allowances that would have been paid under the Youth Allowances Act, as it read before being repealed by this Act, during that portion of that year that is before the repeal of the Youth Allowances Act, and

(ii) the benefits that would have been paid under this Act with respect to persons described in subsection 3(3) during that portion of that year that is after the repeal of the Youth Allowances Act,

and during which that province provided for the payment of allowances or benefits described in paragraph 3(3)(a) or (b), if allowances or benefits described in subparagraph (i) or (ii) had been payable to parents resident in that province; or

(b) the aggregate of allowances and benefits described in paragraphs 3(3)(a) and (b) that were provided by that province in that taxation year,

whichever is the lesser.

(2.1) Where for any taxation year, with respect to any province, the amount of the aggregate determined in accordance with paragraph (2)(a) exceeds the amount of the aggregate determined in accordance with paragraph (2)(b), the amount of the excess shall stand to the credit of that province for the purpose of subsection (2.2).

(2.2) Where for any taxation year, with respect to any province, the aggregate determined in accordance with paragraph (2)(b) exceeds the aggregate determined in accordance with paragraph (2)(a), the amount that may otherwise be recovered from the province for the year pursuant to section 6.1 of the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Revision Act, 1964 shall be reduced by the amount of the excess, except that such reduction shall not exceed the amount standing to the credit of that province for the purpose of this subsection."

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons that Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, now before the House, be amended by striking out lines 10 to 26 of Clause 23 on page 24 and substituting the following:

"(a) the aggregate of

(i) the allowances that would have been paid under the *Youth Allowances Act*, as it read before being repealed by this Act, during that portion of that year that is before the repeal of the *Youth Allowances Act*, and

(ii) the benefits that would have been paid under this Act with respect to persons described in subsection 3(3) during that portion of that year that is after the repeal of the *Youth Allowances Act*,

and during which that province provided for the payment of allowances or benefits described in paragraph 3(3)(a) or (b), if allowances or benefits described in subparagraph (i) or (ii) had been payable to parents resident in that province; or

(b) the aggregate of allowances and benefits described in paragraphs 3(3)(a) and (b) that were provided by that province in that taxation year,

whichever is the lesser.

(2.1) Where for any taxation year, with respect to any province, the amount of the aggregate determined in accordance with paragraph (2)(a) exceeds the amount of the aggregate determined in accordance with paragraph (2)(b), the amount of the excess shall stand to the credit of that province for the purpose of subsection (2.2).

(2.2) Where for any taxation year, with respect to any province, the aggregate determined in accordance with paragraph (2)(b) exceeds the aggregate determined in accordance with paragraph (2)(a), the amount that may otherwise be recovered from the province for the year pursuant to section 6.1 of the *Federal-Provincial Fiscal Revision Act, 1964* shall be reduced by the amount of the excess, except that such reduction shall not exceed the amount standing to the credit of that province for the purpose of this subsection."

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mr. Gilbert, moved,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by deleting therefrom Clause 24, being lines 31 to 37 on page 24 of the said Bill.

After debate thereon, pursuant to Special Order made Friday, June 23, 1972, the said debate was interrupted.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface) for Mr. Foster, from the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, presented the Fourth Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Friday, June 23, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-215, An Act to amend the Pension Act, and has agreed to report it without amendment.

Your Committee recommends to the House that consideration be given to amending Bill C-215 by substituting the word "fifteen" for the word "ten" in line 15 of the said Bill.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence relating to this Bill (*Issue No. 10*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 35 to the Journals).

By unanimous consent, Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Report of the Tariff Board, relative to the Investigation ordered by the Minister of Finance respecting Strawberries for Processing—Reference No. 148 (English and French), together with a copy of the transcript of evidence presented at the public hearings, pursuant to section 6 of the Tariff Board Act, chapter T-1, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-4/1.

Consideration was resumed at the report stage of Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, as reported (with an amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mr. Gilbert,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by deleting therefrom Clause 24, being lines 31 to 37 on page 24 of the said Bill.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.

And the House having proceeded to the deferred division on the motion of Mr. Marshall, seconded by Mr. Baldwin,—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by deleting subclause 3(4), lines 1 to 4 on page 4.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 43)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander,	Forrestall,	Lambert	McCutcheon,	Rock,
Alkenbrack,	Fortin,	(Bellechasse),	McGrath,	Rodrigue,
Asselin,	Gauthier,	Lambert	McIntosh,	Rowland,
Baldwin,	Gilbert,	(Edmonton West),	McKinley,	Rynard,
Barnett,	Godin,	Laprise,	McQuaid,	Simpson,
Beaudoin,	Grills,	Latulippe,	Marshall,	Southam,
Bell,	Gundlock,	Lewis,	Monteith,	Stanfield,
Benjamin,	Hales,	Lundrigan,	Muir,	Stewart
Bigg,	Harding,	MacDonald	Murta,	(Marquette),
Brewin,	Harkness,	(Egmont),	Nesbitt,	Tétrault,
Burton,	Hees,	MacInnis (Cape	Noble,	Thomas
Cadieu,	Howe,	Breton-East	Nowlan,	(Moncton),
Carter,	Knight,	Richmond),	Nystrom,	Thomson
Danforth,	Knowles (Winnipeg	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Orlikow,	(Battleford-
Diefenbaker,	North Centre),	MacKay,	Paproski,	Kindersley),
Dionne,	Knowles (Norfolk-	MacLean,	Peddle,	Winch,
Fairweather,	Haldimand),	Macquarrie,	Peters,	Woolliams—77.
Flemming,		McCleave,	Ritchie,	

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Davis,	Jamieson,	Marchand	Smerchanski,
Andras,	Deachman,	Jerome,	(Kamloops-	Smith
Badanai,	Deakon,	Kaplan,	Cariboo),	(Saint-Jean),
Barrett,	De Bané,	Kierans,	Morison,	Stafford,
Béchar,	Drury,	Lachance,	Munro,	Stewart
Beer,	Dupras,	Langlois,	Noël,	(Cochrane),
Benson,	Duquet,	Laniel,	O'Connell,	St. Pierre,
Blair,	Forest,	La Salle,	Olson,	Sullivan,
Blouin,	Forget,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Osler,	Thomas
Borrie,	Francis,	Lefebvre,	Otto,	(Maisonneuve-
Breau,	Gendron,	Legault,	Ouellet,	Rosemont),
Buchanan,	Gervais,	Lessard (LaSalle),	Pelletier,	Tolmie,
Caccia,	Gibson,	Lessard	Penner,	Trudeau,
Cafik,	Gillespie,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Pepin,	Trudel,
Chappell,	Goode,	Lind,	Portelance,	Turner
Chrétien,	Goyer,	Loiselle,	Pringle,	(London East),
Clermont,	Gray,	MacEachen,	Prud'homme,	Turner (Ottawa-
Cobbe,	Guay (St. Boniface),	Mackasey,	Richard,	Carleton),
Corbin,	Guay (Lévis),	McBride,	Robinson,	Walker,
Corriveau,	Guilbault,	McNulty,	Rochon,	Watson,
Côté (Longueuil),	Hellyer,	Mahoney,	Roy (Timmins),	Weatherhead,
Cullen,	Hopkins,	Major,	Roy (Laval),	Whicher,
Cyr,	Howard (Okanagan	Marceau,	Serré,	Whiting—110.
Danson,	Boundary),	Marchand	Sharp,	
	Hymmen,	(Langelier),		

And the House having proceeded to the deferred division on the motion of Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mr. Gilbert,—That Bill C-170, An

Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be amended by deleting therefrom Clause 24, being lines 31 to 37 on page 24 of the said Bill.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 44)

YEAS

Messrs.

Barnett,	Fortin,	Knight,	Latulippe,	Rodrigue,
Beaudoin,	Gauthier,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Lewis,	Rowland,
Benjamin,	Gilbert,	North Centre),	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Tétrault,
Brewin,	Godin,	Lambert	Nystrom,	Thomson
Burton,	Harding,	(Bellechasse),	Orlikow,	(Battleford-
Dionne,	Hellyer,	Laprise,	Peters,	Kindersley),
				Winch—27.

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander,	Dupras,	Lachance,	Marceau,	Roy
Alkenbrack,	Duquet,	Lambert	Marchand	(Laval),
Allmand,	Fairweather,	(Edmonton West),	(Langelier),	Rynard,
Andras,	Flemming,	Langlois,	Marchand	Serré,
Asselin,	Forest,	Laniel,	(Kamloops-	Sharp,
Badanai,	Forget,	La Salle,	Cariboo),	Simpson,
Baldwin,	Forrestall,	Leblanc	Marshall,	Smerchanski,
Barrett,	Francis,	(Laurier),	Monteith,	Smith
Bécharde,	Gendron,	Lefebvre,	Morison,	(Saint-Jean),
Beer,	Gervais,	Legault,	Muir,	Southam,
Bell,	Gibson,	Lessard	Munro,	Stafford,
Benson,	Gillespie,	(LaSalle),	Murta,	Stanfield,
Bigg,	Goode,	Lessard	Nesbitt,	Stewart
Blair,	Goyer,	(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Noble,	(Cochrane),
Blouin,	Gray,	Lind,	Noël,	Stewart
Borrie,	Grills,	Loiselle,	Nowlan,	(Marquette),
Breau,	Guay	Lundrigan,	O'Connell,	St. Pierre,
Buchanan,	(St. Boniface),	MacDonald	Olson,	Sullivan,
Caccia,	Guay	(Egmont),	Osler,	Thomas
Cadieu,	(Lévis),	MacEachen,	Otto,	(Maisonneuve-
Cafk,	Guilbault,	MacInnis	Ouellet,	Rosemont),
Carter,	Gundlock,	(Cape Breton-	Paproski,	Thomas
Chappell,	Hales,	East Richmond),	Peddle,	(Moncton),
Chrétien,	Harkness,	Mackasey,	Pelletier,	Tolmie,
Clermont,	Hees,	MacKay,	Penner,	Trudeau,
Cobbe,	Hopkins,	MacLean,	Pepin,	Trudel,
Corbin,	Howard	Macquarrie,	Portelance,	Turner
Corriveau,	(Okanagan	McBride,	Pringle,	(London East),
Côté (Longueuil),	Boundary),	McCleave,	Prud'homme,	Turner
Cullen,	Howe,	McCutcheon,	Richard,	(Ottawa-Carleton),
Cyr,	Hymmen,	McGrath,	Ritchie,	Walker,
Danforth,	Jamieson,	McIntosh,	Robinson,	Watson,
Danson,	Jerome,	McKinley,	Rochon,	Weatherhead,
Davis,	Kaplan,	McNulty,	Rock,	Whicher,
Deachman,	Kierans,	McQuaid,	Roy	Whiting,
De Bané,	Knowles (Norfolk-	Mahoney,	(Timmins),	Woolliams—159.
Diefenbaker,	Haldimand),	Major,		
Drury,				

On motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, the said bill, as amended, was concurred in at the report

stage, and ordered for a third reading at the next sitting of the House.

The Order being read for the report stage of Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Agriculture;

Mr. Baldwin for Mr. Mazankowski, seconded by Mr. Hees, moved,—That Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, be amended by deleting lines 8 to 15 on page 1 thereof and by substituting therefor the following:

“(1.1) The Corporation has all the powers necessary to carry out such duties or functions in relation to the administration of any agricultural program as is assigned to it pursuant to any other Act of the Parliament of Canada.”

And debate arising thereon;

By unanimous consent, the said debate was adjourned.

The Order being read for the report stage of Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration;

Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. MacDonald (Egmont), moved,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 29 on page 1 thereof and striking out the words “Now Therefore,” where they appear in line 1 on page 2 thereof.

And debate arising thereon;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works of Bill C-12, An Act to provide for the establishment of an Environmental Council of Canada;

Mr. Goode, seconded by Mr. Deachman, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Consideration was resumed at the report stage of Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. MacDonald (Egmont),—That Bill C-183,

An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 29 on page 1 thereof and striking out the words “Now Therefore,” where they appear in line 1 on page 2 thereof.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived, on division.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At ten o'clock p.m., the question “That this House do now adjourn” was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. Smerchanski, Cadieu and Ritchie for Messrs. Cyr, Mazankowski and Downey on the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Lefebvre for Mr. Legault on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mrs. MacInnis for Mr. Mather on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton) for Mr. MacInnis on the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Roy (Laval) for Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo) on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Legault for Mr. Lefebvre on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Bigg for Mr. Mazankowski on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Serré for Mr. Crossman on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Messrs. Jerome, Chappell, Deakon and Robinson for Messrs. Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean), Thomas (Maison-neuve-Rosemont), Cyr and Yanakis on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Scott for Mr. Schumacher on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Chappell for Mr. Thomas (Maison-neuve-Rosemont) on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Breau for Mr. Laflamme on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Cyr for Mr. Smith (Saint-Jean) on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Southam for Mr. Schumacher on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Olson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Farm Credit Corporation, including its Accounts and Financial Statements for the fiscal year

ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/142.

By Mr. Turner, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on the Administration of the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 12(2) of the said Act, chapter F-22, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/147.

At 10.15 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 83

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Chrétien, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copy of "Expanded Guidelines for Northern Pipelines". (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-7/13.

Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Chrétien, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-225, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in respect of off-track betting, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following seven Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns.

No. 59—*Mr. Beaudoin*

1. Since 1960, what was the total amount spent or invested by the federal government in the constituency of Richmond?

2. What projects have been carried out or are planned?

3. Where are they located?

4. What amount is invested by the federal government in each project?

5. Does the government intend to spend money in the constituency of Richmond in the near future and, if so, how much and in what areas?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/59.

No. 148—*Mr. Orlikow*

What public relations firms and economic and social research organizations commissioned by government departments, agencies or Crown corporations have been hired or given contracts to produce pamphlets, brochures, economic surveys, etc., to explain government policies to the public and (a) by what department or agency were they hired (b) for what specific task were they hired (c) what amount did they receive (d) was the firm chosen by asking for tenders and, if not, how was the choice made?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/148.

No. 190—*Mr. Orlikow*

1. What was the total full-time payroll, by sex, of each of the federal departments and agencies as of April 1, 1968?

2. How many persons, by sex, were earning more than \$15,000 annually, distributed according to \$1,000 intervals?

3. What was the total full-time payroll, by sex, of each of the federal departments and agencies as of April 1, 1971?

4. How many persons, by sex, were earning more than \$18,000 annually, distributed according to \$1,000 intervals?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/190.

No. 254—*Mr. Forest*

1. Since 1960, and per year, how many murders were committed (a) in Canada (b) per province (c) in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver?

2. Since 1967, and per year, how many policemen, constables, sheriffs or other such persons employed for the maintenance of the public peace, acting in the course of their duties, have been killed (a) in Canada (b) per province?

3. Since 1967, and per year, how many wardens, jailers or other employees of a prison, acting in the course of their duties, have been killed (a) in Canada (b) per province?

4. Since 1967, and per year, how many death sentences have been commuted, in the case of homicide of policemen, constables, sheriffs, prison wardens, jailers or other such persons, acting in the course of their duties?

5. Since 1960, and per year since, how many persons sentenced to (a) perpetual imprisonment (b) for a period of over twenty years, for homicide, have had their sentence reduced or would have been conditionally liberated?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/254.

No. 480—*Mr. Nystrom*

1. What were the amounts spent by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce on publicity and/or information in the fiscal year 1970-71?

2. (a) What were the names and addresses of firms with which the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce entered into contract in 1970-71 for the purpose of publicity and/or information (b) what were the amounts of money involved in each case (c) what was the specific purpose of each contract?

3. (a) What were the amounts provided in the main and supplementary estimates of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year 1971-72 for the purpose of publicity and/or information (b) what amounts were spent or contracted for to date (c) what are the names and addresses of private firms with which the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce entered into contract (d) what are the amounts of money involved in each case (e) what is the specific purpose of each contract?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/480.

No. 519—*Mr. Blackburn*

1. At what level does Canada maintain diplomatic relations with (a) Algeria (b) Bahrain (c) Egypt (d) Federation of Arab Emirates (e) Iran (f) Iraq (g) Israel (h) Jordan (i) Kuwait (j) Lebanon (k) Libya (l) Mauritania (m) Morocco (n) People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (o) Republic of Yemen (p) Saudi Arabia (q) Sudan (r) Syria (s) Tunisia (t) Turkey?

2. (a) In which of these states does Canada maintain consulates separate from embassies, and where are these consulates located (b) where Canada recognizes these states but does not maintain permanent diplomatic establishments, how are the consular needs of visiting Canadian nationals met?

3. In those states listed in part 1 where Canada maintains permanent local diplomatic establishments (a) what is the total number of staff in each case (b) what number represents Canadian nationals (c) what number represents nationals of the host state hired locally?

4. In those states listed in part 1 where Canada maintains local diplomatic establishments (a) what are the latest total annual cost figures in each case, including salaries at all levels and general operating costs (b) what number of Canadian foreign service officers (diplomatic and commercial) have a speaking and reading knowledge of the native languages, specifically Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Hebrew where applicable (c) what provision does the Department of External Affairs make for the training of such officers in the Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Hebrew languages, and from what institutions, domestic or foreign, is such language training received (d) what provision does the Department make for the introduction of such officers to non-linguistic aspects of the cultures of the Middle East and North Africa, and by what institutions, domestic or foreign, is such training provided (e) in its policy for hiring trainees for the foreign service (diplomatic and commercial), does the Department take any special interest in applicants whose university education has included a solid training in area studies, including linguistic competence in the languages of the non-Western world?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/519.

No. 551—*Mr. Mazankowski*

1. How many Agriculture Training Program courses were offered by the Department of Manpower and Immigration under the auspices of the Canada Manpower Training Program, by province?

2. How many people participated in these courses, by province, and what was the total cost by province?

3. What was the average amount paid to an individual while participating in such courses, by province?

4. What was the duration of such courses?

5. Is each province consulted as to content and formulation of course of studies and, if so, how is this undertaken?

6. Are individual municipalities consulted as to content and formulation of study courses before the program is instituted and, if not, for what reason?

7. What are the criteria for selection for people to participate, by province?

8. Who are the present members of the Alberta Manpower Committee, including government and farm organizations?

9. Who participated in the eleven Farm Management Courses offered in Alberta in 1971-72?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/551.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 5, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all reports or other documents relating to tests or experiments conducted to date by or on order of the Department of National Health and Welfare on usage of marijuana,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 22, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by the Economist Intelligence Unit on guidance and assessment of the Canadian textile industry, undertaken for the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in the fiscal year 1966-67, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the 1st Session of this Parliament,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 34, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Gherzi Textile Organization on the Canadian textile industry undertaken for the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in the fiscal year 1966-67, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the 1st Session of this Parliament,

having been called was, at the request of the Honourable the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 46, as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all contracts dealing with publicity and/or information entered into by the Department of National Health and Welfare in the fiscal years 1970-71 and 1971-72,

having been called was, at the request of the honourable Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Ordered,—That there be laid before this House copies of all contracts dealing with publicity and/or information entered into by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in the fiscal years 1970-71 and 1971-72.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 48—Mr. Nystrom*).

Resolved,—That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of the Agreement or an exchange of correspondence between the Government of Great Britain and the Government of Canada governing the use and terms of such use of that portion of the Suffield experimental station in Alberta for training purposes by British troops, including British armoured vehicles.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 58—Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West)*).

Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 68, as follows:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of the correspondence between the provincial governments and the federal government with respect to the deteriorating mail service, particularly the courier service set up recently by the Province of Alberta to provide more efficient mail service between Calgary and Edmonton or any similar mail courier service established by any other province,

having been called was, at the request of the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) for the honourable Member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)" pursuant to Standing Order 48(1).

Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, was again considered at the report stage.

Whereupon, The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Mazankowski, seconded by Mr. Hees,—That Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, be amended by deleting lines 8 to 15 on page 1 thereof and by substituting therefor the following:

"(1.1) The Corporation has all the powers necessary to carry out such duties or functions in relation to the administration of any agricultural program as is assigned to it pursuant to any other Act of the Parliament of Canada."

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.

Motion numbered 2, as follows: That Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, be amended by repealing subclause 5(2), lines 30 and 31 on page 3 thereof, and substituting therefor:

"(2) Subsection 23(3) of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

'(3) Notwithstanding section 17 and subsection (2) of this section, where a borrower under the age of thirty years first obtains a loan under this Act, the Governor in Council shall not prescribe a rate of interest in respect of that loan in excess of five per cent.' "

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair has for consideration and decision whether amendment No. 2 standing in the name of the honourable Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) can be accepted by the Chair as being procedurally correct. In my initial remarks I indicated that I had two concerns. One was that the proposed amendment, if it were enacted, might be a charge against the Treasury and there was no recommendation accompanying the motion. The second was that it appears to go behind the bill and purports to amend the Farm Credit Act.

The honourable Member for Vegreville, the honourable Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and the honourable Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Knight) have argued, with respect to the first point, that it may not necessarily be a charge against the Treasury. I would like to look at that argument if I were to base my ruling upon it but in any event, I want to base my ruling on the second point which, I indicated earlier, was a bar to the acceptance of this motion. The motion does in fact purport to amend the act and, as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) has pointed out the authorities are clear that this is not acceptable from a procedural standpoint. I must therefore decline the motion on this basis.

And the House having proceeded to the deferred division on the motion of Mr. Mazankowski, seconded by Mr. Hees,—That Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act, be amended by deleting lines 8 to 15 on page 1 thereof and by substituting therefor the following:

"(1.1) The Corporation has all the powers necessary to carry out such duties or functions in relation to the administration of any agricultural program as is assigned to it pursuant to any other Act of the Parliament of Canada."

And the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 45)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander,	Fairweather,
Alkenbrack,	Flemming,
Baldwin,	Forrestall,
Barnett,	Fortin,
Beaudoin,	Gauthier,
Bell,	Gilbert,
Benjamin,	Gleave,
Broadbent,	Godin,
Burton,	Grills,
Cadieu,	Gundlock,
Carter,	Harding,
Coates,	Harkness,
Crouse,	Horner,
Danforth,	Knight,
Dionne,	Knowles (Winnipeg
	North Centre),

Knowles (Norfolk-
Haldimand),
Lambert
(Edmonton West),
Latulippe,
Lewis,
Lundrigan,
MacDonald
(Egmont),
MacInnis (Mrs.),
MacKay,
MacLean,
Macquarrie,
McCutcheon,
McGrath,

McKinley,
Marshall,
Mather,
Matte,
Mazankowski,
Muir,
Murta,
Noble,
Nystrom,
Peddle,
Peters,
Ritchie,
Rodrigue,
Rose,
Rowland,

Rynard,
Saltsman,
Scott,
Simpson,
Skoreyko,
Southam,
Stanfield,
Stewart
(Marquette),
Tétrault,
Thomas
(Moncton),
Thomson
(Battleford-
Kindersley),
Winch—69.

NAYS

Messrs.

Badanai,	Caccia,
Basford,	Cafik,
Bécharde,	Chappell,
Benson,	Chrétien,
Blouin,	Clermont,
Borrie,	Cobbe,
Boulanger,	Corbin,
Breau,	Corriveau,
Buchanan,	Côté (Richelieu),

Crossman,
Cullen,
Cyr,
Danson,
Davis,
Deachman,
Deakon,
De Bané,
Drury,

Dubé,
Duquet,
Éthier,
Forest,
Forget,
Foster,
Gendron,
Gibson,
Gillespie,

Goode,
Guay (St. Boniface),
Guay (Lévis),
Guilbault,
Haidasz,
Hopkins,
Hymmen,
Isabelle,
Jerome,

Kaplan,	Lind,	Orange,	Roy (Timmins),	Thomas
Laflamme,	Loiselle,	Osler,	Roy (Laval),	(Maisonneuve-
Lajoie,	Macdonald	Otto,	Serré,	Rosemont),
Lang (Saskatoon-	(Rosedale),	Ouellet,	Smerchanski,	Trudeau,
Humboldt),	MacGuigan,	Pelletier,	Smith	Trudel,
Langlois,	McBride,	Pepin,	(Northumberland-	Turner
Laniel,	McNulty,	Perrault,	Miramichi),	(London East),
La Salle,	Mahoney,	Portelance,	Smith	Wahn,
Leblanc (Laurier),	Marchand	Prud'homme,	(Saint-Jean),	Walker,
Lefebvre,	(Kamloops-	Richardson,	Stanbury,	Watson,
Legault,	Cariboo),	Roberts,	Stewart (Okanagan-	Weatherhead,
Lessard (LaSalle),	Noël,	Robinson,	Kootenay),	Whelan,
Lessard	Olson,	Rochon,	Sullivan,	Yanakis—99.
(Lac-Saint-Jean),				

On motion of Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), the said bill was concurred in at the report stage and ordered for a third reading at the next sitting of the House.

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed Bill C-221, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1973.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Crossman for Mr. Lefebvre on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Messrs. Guay (St. Boniface) and Breau for Messrs. Comtois and Roy (Laval) on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Mather for Mrs. MacInnis on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Olson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, —Report of the Agricultural Products Board for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 7 of the Agricultural Products Board Act, chapter A-5, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/51.

By Mr. Olson,—Report of the Agricultural Stabilization Board for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 14 of the Agricultural Stabilization Act, chapter A-9, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/52.

At 6.05 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Order made on Friday, June 23, 1972.

No. 84

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

The Order being read for the third reading of Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children;

Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

After debate thereon, pursuant to Special Order made Friday, June 23, 1972, the said debate was interrupted.

Mr. Andras, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Report, dated June 5, 1972, of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, under the Combines Investigation Act, relating to the supply and sale of Beer in Ontario. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-4/20.

Mr. Rose, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-226, An Act to establish an Administrative Review Board, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

24960—23½

Mr. Rose, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-227, An Act to amend the Harbour Commissions Act (Commission membership), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mrs. MacInnis, moved in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-170 be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs for the purpose of reconsidering the portions of Clause 6 and of such other clauses that impose a means or income test for the receipt of benefits under the said Bill.

And debate arising thereon;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

[*Notices of Motions (Papers)*]

Mrs. MacInnis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Interim Report made in March, 1968, by Dr. A. Vennema, Director of Canadian Medical Aid in Vietnam in 1967-68 and for copies of any subsequent correspondence between him and the Department of External Affairs.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 2*).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to "Presenting Reports from Standing and Special Committees".

Mr. Wahn, from the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, presented the Third Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Thursday, February 24, 1972, your Committee has considered the White Paper entitled "Defence in the 70s" and has agreed to report as follows:

PREFACE

Terms of reference and scope of hearings—

On February 24, 1972, the White Paper entitled "Defence in the 70s" was referred by the House of Commons to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. Since the Committee had earlier in the 28th Parliament reported on Canadian defence policy with respect to NATO, NORAD, the United Nations and Peace-keeping, and Maritime Forces, it decided to concentrate most of its effort on reviewing the use of Canadian Armed Forces for the Protection of Canada, including particularly national support and development, assistance to civil authorities and the maintenance of internal security. In concentrating on these aspects, the Committee reserved for further consideration a basic review of the overall defence priorities as detailed on page 16 in the White Paper.

Written briefs—

Advertisements were placed in newspapers across the country inviting written submissions. Major interest groups and associations with an interest in defence policy were invited by letter to submit written briefs. Written briefs (listed in Annex A) were submitted by individuals from all parts of Canada and from a diverse range of interest groups and associations.

In addition, the Committee's advisory staff was asked to prepare a detailed comparison of the White Paper on

Defence with the previous findings, conclusions and recommendations of this Committee. This appears in the Committee's Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (Issue No. 8, March 28, 1972).

Oral hearings—

The Committee invited the Minister of National Defence, the Honourable E. J. Benson, to elaborate on the White Paper in general terms. Senior officials from the Department of National Defence were subsequently asked to give evidence on the use of Canadian Armed Forces for national support and development, for assistance to civil authorities, and for the maintenance of internal security, as well as a briefing on the role and status of Reserve Forces. These meetings provided the Committee with valuable background information.

Some of the written briefs submitted contained statements and opinions that needed elaboration. Accordingly, one individual and representatives of seven organizations were invited to appear before the Committee to provide supplementary oral evidence. To provide the Committee with a different perspective from that of officials from the Department of National Defence, the Committee also invited Dr. Denis Szabo to comment on psychological and sociological implications of the use of Canadian Armed Forces for internal security, and Mr. Ian Smart of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, to comment more generally on the implications of the non-military use of armed forces.

The Committee visited five bases in western and northern Canada—Headquarters Maritime Command Pacific at CFB Esquimalt, CFB Suffield, CFB Calgary, CFB Cold Lake and Northern Region Headquarters at Yellowknife. Its members were particularly interested to receive at Northern Region Headquarters comprehensive briefings on the role of Canadian Armed Forces in national development tasks in northern Canada.

The Committee's visit to western and northern Canadian bases was the first by a Parliamentary Committee concerned with defence. It found the visit extremely valuable in enabling members to see and hear first hand from Commanders in the field how the new defence priorities and roles of the Canadian Armed Forces set out in the White Paper have affected the actual operations of units and bases. It also gave those serving in the Canadian Armed Forces an opportunity to express some of their personal feelings about the administration of defence and service life. The Committee wishes here to record its appreciation to the Department of National Defence for arranging this visit.

INTRODUCTION

The Committee agrees with the basic assumption in the White Paper on Defence that the Canadian Armed Forces can be used with advantage for purposes of a basically non-military nature within Canada, including many of the specific purposes cited in the White Paper. However, the Committee believes it is desirable that the roles of the Canadian Forces should be more clearly defined in

these contexts, certain ambiguities clarified, some potentially contentious issues settled and guidelines for the use of Canadian Armed Forces clearly and visibly set down, in order to avoid possible adverse effects and unanticipated costs that might more than outweigh the immediate benefits sought. While recognizing that the White Paper is a statement of general intent and policy, the Committee believes that a careful examination of the overall implications of such non-military tasks is important.

The Committee's comments and recommendations on these various points comprise the main substance of this interim report. In addition some comments on various other points relating to defence policy not previously dealt with by this Committee in earlier reports are also included.

USE OF CANADIAN ARMED FORCES FOR NATIONAL SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES

The White Paper on Defence notes that:

"Although maintained primarily for purposes of sovereignty and security, the Department of National Defence provides an important reservoir of skills and capabilities which in the past has been drawn upon, and which in the future can be increasingly drawn upon, to contribute to the social and economic development of Canada." (p. 12)

In this context, under the general title of national development, a broad range of activities of a non-military nature, unrelated to the four primary defence priorities, are designated.

The Committee examined the justification given for using the facilities and resources of the Department of National Defence for these activities rather than those of other agencies of the federal government, agencies of provincial governments or those in the private sector. The main reason given in the White Paper for using the Armed Forces is that:

"The inherent characteristics of the Armed Forces combine effective command and organization, high mobility, great flexibility and a range of skills and specialities broader than that of any other national organization. These provide Canada with a resource which may be used to carry out essentially non-military projects of high priority and importance to national development. The objective will be to use the Forces primarily on projects which relate to their capabilities to respond efficiently and promptly to their basic defence roles." (p. 12)

It adds that "The Forces will be called upon, therefore, in conjunction with other government departments to assist development in the civil sector, especially in the remote regions where disciplined task forces with wide experience in adapting to unusual or challenging circumstances is required." (p. 12) A secondary reason is also alluded to in the statement that:

"A further objective of this policy will be to promote greater involvement of the military in the community and to ensure that the community is aware of the ways in which the military sector contributes to achieving national aims and priorities." (p. 12)

Availability of Canadian Armed Forces for provision of assistance in emergencies and search and rescue

The White Paper notes that "The Forces and the Canada Emergency Measures Organization will continue to play an important part in providing relief and assistance in event of natural disasters or other civil emergencies including those resulting from oil spills or other forms of pollution." (p. 13) It further comments that the Forces have been used in the past to assist in flood control operations, fighting forest fires and has had major responsibilities for air-sea search and rescue activities. In subsequent evidence given by departmental officials it was stated that current responsibilities for emergency and disaster relief and search and rescue would not only be continued, but would be given first priority amongst the various national support and development tasks.

The Committee agrees wholeheartedly with the use of Canadian Armed Forces in this emergency role. The established command and control system, communications network, transportation facilities and equipment, and the wide variety of trained personnel are obviously relevant. Such activities being by nature unexpected and challenging and likely to occur in any part of Canada also provide realistic training for other primary defence activities.

Having seen the effectiveness with which military personnel have been employed for an extremely wide variety of emergency relief activities—the Commander of the Northern Region cited 63 contingencies that his headquarters plans for—and the excellent services provided despite limited resources, the Committee believes that this activity of the Canadian Armed Forces throughout the country should be given even more emphasis and publicity.

A special case in the provision of assistance in emergencies is that of assigning to the Canadian Armed Forces specific responsibility for co-ordinating search and rescue operations and in providing equipment for these in conjunction with that provided by other agencies. While this is a heavy responsibility in terms of equipment and manpower, which has to be kept on standby, it is an obvious requirement on humanitarian grounds and also a commitment of Canada as a member of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

The Committee believes, however, that some clarification is needed as to the allocation of costs for emergency relief operations of all kinds and for search and rescue. It considers that both these areas of activity are primarily services provided by the Canadian Armed Forces on the basis of their obvious expertise rather than an inherent part of the defence program. Since

these are service functions that must be provided quite independently of defence requirements *per se*, the Committee believes that costs involved should not be included in the regular defence budget. In particular, the Committee feels that the availability of funds for new search and rescue equipment should not be judged in the context of the capital procurement needs of the Canadian Armed Forces for defence activities.

In these cases the Committee considers that the funds necessary to cover the full costs of domestic emergency relief, other than search and rescue, should be provided through an allocation to the Canadian Emergency Measures Organization. The personnel and equipment of the Canadian Armed Forces kept permanently available for the core service in this area should likewise be charged to the EMO budget. If additional facilities of the Canadian Armed Forces or the Reserve Forces are used, the cost incurred should be recovered from the EMO budget so as not to reduce other areas of the defence budget which have been established for other purposes. In making this recommendation, the Committee accepts that orientation of the EMO program would have to be broadened.

In the case of search and rescue, the Committee recommends that costs be allocated either to EMO or to the Ministry of Transport. In the case of international emergency relief assistance costs should be allocated to the Department of External Affairs budget.

In each case the allocation of the costs to these budgets should not just be a book-keeping entry. Information received by the Committee indicates that such non-defence activities have effectively used up part of the resources available for defence purposes. To rectify this the Committee believes that the Department of National Defence should be allowed to recover equivalent funds to be used for defence purposes.

The use of Canadian Armed Forces to carry out non-military projects and provide services of a quasi-commercial or commercial nature—

The White Paper notes a number of activities the Canadian Armed Forces can carry out under the head "national development" which in fact constitute projects and services of a quasi-commercial or commercial nature. These include such things as aerial surveys, airport and bridge construction, highway construction and air transportation.

While the White Paper does not give much detail with regard to these activities, other than citing specific examples, the Committee was impressed with the evidence given by departmental officials which provided details of the general policies being followed. In this respect, Brigadier-General Bell stated:

"... the definition of support of national development is that it is those activities involving the department which contribute to fostering economic growth, to

ensuring the harmonious natural environment, to enhancing the quality of life and to promoting social justice. Policy guidance within this context begins with the understanding that the primary purpose of the Canadian forces will be to work for peace and security and to safeguard sovereignty and independence, that is the maintenance of a Canadian military capability is primarily for national security reasons.

... National development activities are second in importance and priority to the primary defence activities. ... As a general rule, except for the training values to be derived, it is an overriding consideration. Defence Department support for national development projects will be on a cost recovery basis. We will consider requests for assistance from other federal departments and agencies, from provincial governments and in some circumstances from other agencies in the civil sector for tasks to be undertaken. We will accept projects that can be accomplished within financial, material and personnel resources of the department and the supported agency.

Defence Department support for national development projects and activities must be meaningful in terms of the public interest. They must not inhibit, but rather encourage initiatives in the civil sector. They must not compete with or duplicate similar ongoing programs to the detriment of such programs. Finally, activities must be beneficial to both the department and the community.

The scope of Defence Department participation in national development must be regulated to take into account the possibility of a sudden reassignment of defence resources in the interest of defence priorities without causing undue dislocation or hardship to the supported agency. Thus we must precisely define the scope, time, resources and the implications of withdrawal of departmental support. Of course, we cannot plan for these activities in isolation. Consultation outside the department with other government departments and interested organizations will be essential to the success of any national development support activity which we undertake." (Issue No. 5, pages 4 and 5)

The Committee approves this statement as policy but has two concerns. First, while the Department of National Defence states that "Defence Department support for national development projects... must not inhibit but rather encourage initiative in the civil sector", has adequate assessment of the full costs to the Defence Department of such projects as the Ogilvie River bridge been made and to what extent were the full costs recovered? Second, even when such projects can apparently be completed less expensively and more expeditiously by the Canadian Armed Forces, and are so done, is there any possibility of an adverse longer term effect

on the growth and development of commercial facilities and skills in the private sector? For example, does the use of the Canadian Armed Forces in building bridges and constructing airfields in the Northwest Territories discourage the growth of private companies with expertise in these fields which could become part of a permanent economic infrastructure of the regions? Has the use in the past of Air Transport Command aircraft for resupplying bases in the Arctic significantly reduced the potential market for civilian private operators and thus possibly slowed the development and growth of such a service industry essential to the wider development of the North? The Committee suggests that the Government give careful consideration to such questions.

The impact of defence expenditure on the Canadian economy—

Defence expenditure in terms of personnel, operating and maintenance and in terms of capital equipment procurement is significant. In the 1972-73 Estimates expenditures on these two items under the Canadian Armed Forces Program were \$1,705,604,000 and \$147,564,000 respectively with all budgetary expenditures of the Department of National Defence totalling \$1,939,634,000. The White Paper on Defence states that:

"Although the *payroll* to military and civilian employees is decentralized and has benefited the economies of every province in Canada, the *purchases* of military equipment and other supplies have tended to be concentrated in the more heavily industrialized centres. In the foreseeable future the largest volume of defence purchases will continue to be made in these industrialized areas, but to assist in the attainment of the Government's objective of regional economic equality, further decentralization of defence procurement into all regions of Canada will be encouraged whenever this can be done consistent with long-term economic efficiency." (p. 14)

The Committee agrees that defence expenditure should be directed in such a manner and, more generally, to complement the broad economic policies of the Government providing this does not compromise the operational effectiveness and readiness of the Canadian Armed Forces to carry out the roles and tasks assigned in the White Paper.

However, in cases where bases are maintained in part for regional development purposes—such as CFB Summerside—or where a decision is taken to procure Canadian made equipment rather than cheaper comparable equipment abroad as a means of assisting Canadian industrial development, the extra costs incurred for regional and/or industrial development should be specifically noted in the Estimates. The Committee believes that if such note were made, the public would have a more realistic understanding of both what defence *per se* was costing and what costs the Defence Department was

incurring in supporting economic and regional development.

Although it has been suggested by one witness that such extra costs be actually charged to the budget of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, or the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, the Committee does not consider this feasible or necessary. Unlike the cases where the Committee recommends the recovery of costs by the Department of National Defence from appropriate Departments for such services provided—for emergency relief such as search and rescue and provision of assistance for internal security duties—the Committee considers the extra cost incurred for regional and economic development purposes can be legitimately included in expenditure of the Department of National Defence.

In parallel with the impact of defence expenditures on the economy, there is the impact of defence research and technological development for private industry. The Committee agrees that "spinoff" is valuable, but believes that in order to realize its full potential, the results of defence research should only be classified when absolutely essential for security reasons. In all other cases it should be made readily available for exploitation by the private sector. At the same time care should be taken that in the first instance such research and development is directed to filling the direct and immediate needs of the Defence Department.

The Canadian Armed Forces also make available test facilities—such as those of the Aerospace Engineering and Test Establishment at CFB Cold Lake—to both the private sector and, on occasion to provincial and foreign governments. The Canadian Government recovers the cost of provision of such services. The Committee was impressed by the services being provided by AETE and believes these should continue to be made available to the private sector. However it recommends that the Department of National Defence be reimbursed for the costs it incurs in providing this assistance. At present costs recovered are credited to the consolidated revenue account and not to the Department, although the latter bears the full operating costs.

In this regard the Committee was given briefings on the work of the Defence Research Establishment of the Defence Research Board carried out at Suffield. It learned that research was also being carried out in various fields such as thermal destruction of DDT, which are of immediate value to other government departments, but appears of little military significance. While such research might well be considered a suitable task under the heading of national development, the Committee believes that as a general principle all research and development of the Defence Research Board that is not primarily related to defence policy and the immediate requirements of the Department of National Defence might better be carried out with the financial support of the National Research Council or another appropriate agency concerned with non-defence work.

The use of the Canadian Armed Forces for development of Canadian unity—

The Committee agrees that the Armed Forces have great potential in promoting Canadian unity because of their size and their acceptance by most Canadians as a truly national institution that transcends regional, linguistic, and political divisions in the country. To fully realize their potential contribution however, a Department of National Defence witness stated that "within our organization, the Canadian Forces should reflect the composition of our society. To this end we have been a leader in providing equal job opportunities for women, northern residents and French-speaking Canadians." While the Committee accepts and fully supports this policy, it has noted some shortcomings in its realization. In particular it understands that there has been some difficulty in recruiting French-speaking Canadians with university education into the Forces as junior officers.

Availability and efficiency of the Canadian Armed Forces for carrying out national support and development tasks—

The Committee has concluded that clarification is needed as to the precise extent to which the Canadian Armed Forces are available for national support and development tasks without compromising either their ready availability to meet primary defence requirements or the time necessary to train and achieve a state of operational readiness appropriate for these.

While a departmental witness has stated that "...our participation in national development activities must be closely monitored in order that basic military capabilities are not impaired..." the Committee heard during its visit to bases in western Canada that training for military operations was being reduced so that personnel could be made available for national development activities. Similarly it heard that personnel required for the maintenance of equipment, were on occasion utilized for emergencies such as forest fire fighting to the detriment of such maintenance.

The White Paper states that the Armed Forces "...in the future can be increasingly drawn upon to contribute to the social and economic development of Canada...". In view of the evidence presented to it, the Committee recommends that the government consider carefully all the possible alternatives; for example, can the allocation of equipment, facilities and personnel be made more efficient so as to permit this increased emphasis on social and economic development? Should the military budget be increased for that purpose? Should specific activities and commitments be dropped? Should the state of operational readiness for military commitments be lowered, or are there other alternatives?

A further question arises from the increased expectation of the public that the Canadian Armed Forces will be readily available for national development activities regardless of military commitments or requirements which by their nature seem more abstract and less

imperative than domestic tasks. While departmental witnesses have also stated that "national development activities are second in importance and priority to the primary defence activities" the Committee is not convinced that this is always the case or indeed always possible in practice. The pressure of public opinion which often demands assistance by the Canadian Armed Forces for community projects is often such that it can only be ignored at the expense of worsened community-military relations in the area concerned.

The Committee is also concerned as to what extent it is always efficient to use the Canadian Armed Forces for national development tasks. While it generally agrees that the Canadian Armed Forces constitute a readily available reservoir of personnel and equipment for such tasks, most of the personnel are highly (and expensively) trained in areas that often have little relevance to the substance of national development activities being undertaken—such as the Student Summer Employment Program. This being the case it feels that a serious attempt should be made to ascertain all the direct and indirect costs of the military participating in such activities in order to be able to compare them with the cost of existing or potential services of a similar sort in the private sector.

Maintenance of cadet corps as national development projects—

During its hearings in Ottawa, and while on its visit to bases in western and northern Canada, the Committee examined the role of cadet corps. While these are largely supported through funds raised privately and trained by volunteer personnel, the Department of National Defence assists in their maintenance through providing operating grants, some equipment, skilled personnel for special training, and making available some specialized facilities.

Although cadet training does stimulate an interest in those involved in considering future careers in the Canadian Armed Forces, the Committee was assured that the primary aim of this program is character development and leadership training. This assistance to cadet corps can therefore be regarded as a national development and support activity. The Committee believes the Cadet organization is performing a valuable service, it supports strongly the program of cadet training and recommends that the Government extend to it additional encouragement and support. It welcomes plans for the expansion of the cadet movement in the Northwest Territories carried on outside and complementary to the formal school system as particularly timely and relevant.

The Committee noted an apparent inconsistency with respect to remuneration for those participating in full-time cadet corps training camps during the summer and those employed by the Department of National Defence under the Summer Student Employment Program. Those completing cadet training camps—usually of six or eight weeks duration—are paid a \$100. training bonus on completion of training. Those employed under the SSEP program receive varying amounts depending on the nature of employment and in some instances that has been

up to and in excess of \$380. per month. The danger of this differential in remuneration appeared to be that those about to enter their last year of a carefully developed and cumulative cadet training program will be tempted instead to seek employment under SSEP. The individual thereby loses through uncompleted training and the cadet corps loses as a whole because a reduced number of senior cadets are available for leadership positions. The Committee recommends that the Government examine this problem carefully and take action to remove the apparent inconsistency in treatment.

Clarification of priorities within national development activities—

The White Paper on Defence gives no indication as to the relative priority of the various types of national development activities cited. Given the limited resources available to the Canadian Armed Forces the Committee considers that such a set of priorities should be made known to the public. Subsequent to publication of the White Paper, the Committee has received evidence from the Department outlining these priorities as follows:

"On the basis of the need for the Canadian Forces to participate in a meaningful and beneficial national support and development program, the following activities suggest themselves in order of priority:

Emergency and disaster relief and search and rescue: Current responsibilities should be continued.

Education and training: Current personnel policies regarding education and training have a considerable but indirect impact upon national development. These activities should be expanded consistent with service requirements especially in areas applicable to the development of the North and of the continental margins.

Economic development: Ways and means should be examined to ensure that departmental expenditures make the optimum contribution to our economic growth consistent with defence priorities.

Northern development: Technical elements of the Canadian Forces, particularly engineer, communication, transportation and service units, which are well suited for this task, should be prepared to assist in major projects as required.

Youth programs: The success of the longstanding cadet programs and the recent Student Summer Employment Program indicates that the Department can obtain considerable support for its youth-oriented activities from the general public and should expand them at least to the extent of making special provision for northern residents.

Community support: Official and voluntary support of the community is already at a high level and it is unlikely that the level of voluntary support can be radically increased. As this is a successful program, support should be continued at the present level of activities.

National unity: Departmental support of government policies respecting national unity, particularly

those pertaining to bilingualism, are well advanced and should continue to be given high priority. Support for international sports events and ceremonials should also be given precedence.

Antipollution and conservation: The Department can make a considerable contribution when called upon; thus, antipollution measures within the Department should be continued and plans for emergencies co-ordinated with other departments and agencies.

Support of external development: The application of our national development resources to external development programs should continue at approximately the same level." The Committee appreciates this important amplification.

USES OF ARMED FORCES TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES FOR PROTECTION OF CANADA

The White Paper asserts under the general title of Protection of Canada that the general surveillance of Canadian airspace and waters required for national security by the Canadian Armed Forces "... will permit greater support to other departments". This use of Canadian Armed Forces to provide assistance to civil authorities—in addition to direct military roles related to surveillance and control—has to be viewed within the context of the White Paper's delineation of Departmental responsibilities and relationships which is as follows:

"The Government's objective is to continue effective occupation of Canadian territory, and to have a surveillance and control capability to the extent necessary to safeguard national interests in all Canadian territory, and all airspace and waters over which Canada exercises sovereignty or jurisdiction. This involves a complex judgment on the challenges which could occur and on the surveillance and control capability required in the circumstances.

The Canadian Forces do not have sole responsibility for ensuring respect for relevant Canadian legislation but they do have a general responsibility for surveillance and control over land, sea and airspace under Canadian jurisdiction. In peacetime this role of the Forces is in many respects complementary to that of the civil authorities. The requirements for military assistance is generally greater, however, in more sparsely settled regions until a stage of economic and social development has been reached justifying an expansion of civil agencies and resources. Similarly, where the Canadian Forces have the capability to meet a shortage in civil resources for the policing of waters off the coasts, their role can be expanded.

The area to be covered is vast. In certain regions facilities are limited and weather conditions are often adverse. The problem would perhaps be simpler if it were restricted to the more traditional security threat of direct military attack from a predictable enemy. Instead, challenges could arise in

more ambiguous circumstances from private entities as well as foreign government agencies. Incidents may involve, for instance, a fishing vessel, an oil tanker or a private aircraft. But the principle involved is well established. By creating a capability for surveillance and control which is effective and visible, the intention is to discourage such challenges.

Other departments of government already have specific responsibilities in many instances for regulating activity in Canadian territory, and these lead to requirements for carrying out surveillance and exercising control. National Defence has, however, ultimate responsibility to ensure that overall an adequate Canadian surveillance and control capability exists for the protection of Canadian sovereignty and security. Consequently the Government intends to establish Canadian Forces operations centres on the East and West coasts which will work closely with the civil departments to co-ordinate surveillance and control activity. Where required by potential challenges to our interests the Canadian Forces will carry out surveillance and exercise control in those areas not covered by the civil departments, or in which the latter require assistance in discharging their responsibilities. Close consultation between National Defence and the civil departments concerned will be maintained on a continuing basis to ensure that surveillance and control is being exercised when, where, and to the extent necessary to satisfy the Government's requirements in the most economical way." (p. 10)

This being the basic *rationale* the White Paper later specifies in detail that:

"The general surveillance of Canadian airspace and waters required for national security will permit greater support to other departments. Initial consultations with the civil departments responsible by legislation for the protection of various specific interests have already indicated several areas where a greater contribution by the Armed Forces will be necessary. They will be kept under review to ensure that the total national effort is both effective and efficient in the use of available resources to meet the Government's requirements. Some of the activities identified are:

- (a) general area surveillance of foreign fishing fleets off the coasts;
- (b) specific reconnaissance missions on a quick-response, short-term basis to locate those fishing fleets when they move and fail to appear where expected;
- (c) area surveillance of offshore waters to detect and report suspected illegal seismic and other exploratory activities;
- (d) assistance in ice reconnaissance operations;
- (e) surveillance when needed of Canadian waters off the East and West coasts and in the North to detect pollution at sea;

(f) surveillance of Canadian territorial waters to detect and report foreign vessels illegally present therein;

(g) surveillance of sites of mineral exploration and exploitation projects in the North when verification of their location and status is required; and

(h) during the appropriate seasons, provision of observer space on aircraft engaged in northern surveillance operations to permit wildlife observation. (p. 19)

The Committee has already commented in detail on the need for protection of many of these national interests in the maritime context in the report of its Subcommittee on Canadian Maritime Forces (Second Session, 28th Parliament). In that report it concluded:

"The Subcommittee is of the opinion that effective maintenance of sovereignty requires a capability of extensive surface and subsurface surveillance and identification, as well as a limited capability to localize and track specific instances of exploitation or violation—whether these be of resource rights on the continental shelf, transport regulations, customs regulations or fisheries regulations to name obvious examples. There is a further requirement for some limited but effective capability to challenge any actual instance of illegal exploitation or other violation of Canadian laws."

And at that time the Subcommittee further stated:

"The Subcommittee favours greater multi-tasking of equipment and personnel between Canadian departments maintaining maritime forces than has been the case. Given the priority the Subcommittee has assigned to the police function and the new requirement to apply Canadian regulations in the expanded territorial sea, as well as in the fishing and pollution control zones, the Subcommittee believes that increased cooperation between the maritimes forces of different departments in support of specific Canadian policies and regulations is indispensable. This represents a rather new approach, but one which the Subcommittee considers to be justified in view of the high initial cost of providing equipment and training personnel and the subsequent cost of maintaining them".

The Committee continues to hold this view and in general concurs with the policy stated in the White Paper in this respect. However it feels that there must be a distinction made between, on the one hand, assistance to civil authorities with respect to safeguarding national interests in all Canadian territory, airspace and territorial waters or waters over which Canada exercises sovereignty and jurisdiction and, on the other, assistance given to civil authorities merely as a service because of the availability of its facilities. The Committee considers that assistance in the first mentioned sense is of direct relevance to Protection of Canada and as such is part of Canada's primary defence priority. It does not regard

assistance in the second mentioned sense, including the cited case of providing observer space on aircraft engaged in Northern surveillance operations to permit wildlife observation, to be primarily concerned with defence objectives. Such assistance is in essence what is more appropriately titled "national support and development", the term used in the annual estimates or budget of the Defence Department. The use of the Canadian Armed Forces for this kind of activity has been commented on previously in this report.

Control and Surveillance in Northern Canada

The Committee particularly commends the action which has been taken to move the headquarters of northern region to Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories. The Committee was pleased to learn that only a small group of less than 30 men was at the Yellowknife headquarters and that the remaining personnel (slightly more than 500 men) were at the various DEW line stations and other localities in the far north. The Committee believes it is essential to have an effective Canadian presence in the Arctic and the Arctic Islands in order to assert Canadian sovereignty as well as to prevent pollution and protect the northern environment. However, the Committee doubts the value of training large military formations of battalion or combat group size, in Northern operations since any perceived threat in that area would be unlikely to require a response in such strength. Such training places an unnecessary strain on manpower and other resources available to the Armed Forces. Training in northern operations should continue but at more appropriate force levels.

During its visit to the Northern Region Headquarters, the Committee received information as to the very valuable functions which can be performed by the Canadian Rangers, a voluntary force consisting of Indians and Eskimos who work in close association with the Canadian Armed Forces. The Committee believes that the Canadian Rangers provide an essential "on the ground" component to the Canadian Armed Forces surveillance and control activity in the North. It recommends that the government give serious consideration to increasing the funds and facilities made available to maintain the Canadian Rangers with a view to increasing its overall strength and effectiveness. Such an increase should include in particular provision for a more direct communication system between Rangers in the field and Northern Region Headquarters, for equipment to provide individual Rangers with even greater mobility, and for training. Further consideration should be given to giving the Canadian Rangers the status of a Reserve Force—with appropriate remuneration when carrying out duties or in training—rather than their present all volunteer status without direct remuneration. In making a recommendation for increasing the strength of the Canadian Rangers, the Committee wishes to stress that opportunities for native people must not in any way be considered limited to this force. On the contrary every

opportunity must be made available for the native peoples to join the Canadian Armed Forces in any capacity for which they are appropriately qualified. In considering the facilities available for surveillance and control in northern Canada, the Committee was also impressed with the need for light, reliable equipment such as STOL aircraft, oversnow vehicles and helicopters. The need for other major equipment requirements for surveillance in the Arctic archipelago—including submarines, surface ships, long range patrol aircraft, and bottom based detection systems—has already been considered in detail in the Subcommittee's Report on Maritime Forces (Second Session 28th Parliament). In addition the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development has previously commented on the adequacy of the ice breaker fleet available for work in the north.

USE OF CANADIAN ARMED FORCES FOR INTERNAL SECURITY

Threats to internal security —

The opening paragraphs of the White Paper detail the important international and domestic changes that had necessitated the "fundamental reappraisal" of Canadian defence policy, one conclusion being that:

"...the threat to society posed by violent revolutionaries and the implications of the recent crisis—although the latter occurred well after the defence review began—merited close consideration in projecting Canadian defence activities in the 1970s." (p. 1)

Later the White paper elaborates on this theme, stating that:

"The Canadian experience over the last two years clearly indicates the necessity of being able to cope effectively with any future resort to disruption, intimidation and violence as weapons of political action. The three prime instances in which the Forces were used recently in this role were during the Montreal police strike, the political kidnapping crisis of last October and the Kingston Penitentiary riots." (p. 11)

and that:

"In addition to the possibility of future crises arising in Canada, there is also the possibility that violent events elsewhere could stimulate outbreaks in Canada. This problem is therefore one with clear international ramifications. Indeed, it appears that much of the world has already moved into an era which will see established order increasingly challenged by organized violence. These are times of confrontation when growing numbers of people appear to be prepared to resort to violence with a view to destroying the democratic process." (p. 11)

Availability of Canadian Armed Forces for Internal Security duties—

On the basis of this assessment of the threat to internal security facing Canada, the Government's position is stated as follows:

"While civil disorder should normally be contained by civil authorities and the strength of municipal, provincial and federal police forces should be maintained at levels sufficient for the purpose, we must nevertheless anticipate the possibility that emergencies will again arise which will necessitate the Canadian Forces coming to the aid of the civil power. It is important that the latter should be able to rely upon timely assistance from the Forces. The Forces role in such situations is important and could be crucial." (p. 11)

In more specific terms, the role and availability of the Canadian Armed Forces is detailed in terms of provision of aid of the Civil Power.

"The Canadian Armed Forces, and in particular the land element, have always had a responsibility to aid the civil power whenever required, and the events of last year have shown how important this role can be. One of the tasks assigned to the three combat groups and the Airborne Regiment is to assist in internal security operations if required. Additional land forces could be made available in an emergency from the Reserves and from forces engaged in other roles. Normal military training prepares the Canadian soldier exceptionally well for this role. Discipline and restraint, which are vital when acting in such a role, are an essential part of military training." (p. 24)

The Minister, during his appearance before the Committee, commented in passing on the fundamental basis for the use of armed forces for internal security duties. Asked whether, philosophically, he accepted "...the proposition that there is a base or justification for the use of military personnel to exercise ... the social will of one group of Canadians over that of another," he responded that:

"... I accept the fact that if we have governments in Canada which are established and democratically elected by the people and they require support whether it be through the police or through the military, the governments must be supported—providing it is that kind of government. Philosophically I think that one must have law and order in a state." (Issue No. 1, pages 13 and 14)

Types of threats to internal security—

The common element in references in the White Paper is to the violent form of the threat to internal security rather than to the nature of the threat itself. The Committee was impressed by the evidence of Mr. Ian Smart that this limited emphasis on the form of threat to internal security—and lack of emphasis on the more basic

nature—has oversimplified the issue. In his evidence Mr. Smart noted:

"When we talk about armed forces and their internal security role, we may think we are raising relatively simple questions about one well-defined area...; about the use of regular military forces to defend assets, group or individual, against purposive, violent, internal threats. However, it has, I think, become entirely unrealistic to ask only the simple obvious questions or to limit our vision to a single neat area... The threats to what we call "internal security" are no longer that simple, they refuse to fit into tidy compartments and they seem to change with baffling speed. In such circumstances, the relatively unchanging character of the means available for responding to those threats may be more of an intellectual comfort than a real advantage.

Threats of internal violence are complicated not only by their form, but also by their authorship and the authorship may be more important than the form just because understanding the enormously varied backgrounds to violence is more important than understanding the depressingly and misleadingly similar forms which it takes. In my view, we spend rather too much time thinking about the forms of violence and its immediate causes, which may be as trivial as the choice of a breakfast cereal and not enough thinking about the underlying circumstances in which, given some trivial cause, violence may occur.

In the case of internal violence, for example, I think there are at least three basic circumstantial types and they are distinguished by the attitudes of their authors.

First, there is the violent criminal, the man who has chosen to defy the law without, however, denying its legitimacy. He is deliberately setting himself up against the rest of his society and his fight is really with the ground rules of the group.

Second, there is the would-be revolutionary, the man who wants to remain within the group, but who disagrees radically with the leadership's evaluation of assets and who wants to substitute his own valuation, possibly by force. His fight is with the leadership, rather than with the group's ground rules.

Third, there is the secessionist, the man who believes the group in its very composition is not able to value assets in a way which he can accept and the only solution is to escape from the group, possibly by force, in order to form or to join another group. His fight is with the composition of the group, not with its rules or its leadership.

People with such very different reasons as these for presenting a violent internal threat sometimes seem to get exactly the same sort of treatment simply because they all give violent expression to their attitudes. This similarity of treatment is often

defended on the grounds that the first object must be to suppress violence and only after that has been done can one tackle the reasons behind the violence, in the courts, in negotiation or in the political process. That, frankly, seems to me to make about as much sense as saying that a doctor should always bring a feverish patient's temperature down to normal before starting to treat the disease that caused the fever." (Issue No. 6, pages 8 and 9)

Without necessarily accepting all the implications of the foregoing remarks, the Committee agrees that the Armed Forces should only be used in exceptional circumstances and as a last resort for the purpose of preserving internal security. The emphasis should be on effective police forces and on removing basic causes of unrest.

Alternate legal and administrative authority for use of Canadian Armed Forces—

The White Paper refers to the legal basis for the use of Canadian Armed Forces for internal security in only two instances. The first reference is particularly vague:

"While civil disorder should normally be contained by the civil authorities, ... we must nevertheless anticipate the possibility that emergencies will again arise which will necessitate the Canadian Forces coming to the aid of the Civil Power." (p. 11)

Later it states that: "The Canadian Armed Forces ... have always had a responsibility to aid the civil power whenever required." (p. 24). Both citations imply that any activity of Canadian Armed Forces with respect to the maintenance of internal security derive their legal bases from the concept of "aid of the Civil Power" as detailed in the *National Defence Act*. In fact the Committee has noted, for example, that Canadian Armed Forces were deployed in October 1970 in Ottawa and Montreal on quite different legal basis. In Ottawa, they were deployed on the instructions of the federal government to protect federal buildings and persons carrying out federal functions. In Montreal they were deployed at the requisition of the Quebec Attorney General in aid of the Civil Power.

Evidence received by the Committee indicated that in practice, Canadian Armed Forces may be used for the maintenance of internal security in at least five distinctly different legal contexts, which the public should be aware of.

1. Under Section 233 of the *National Defence Act* the Canadian Armed Forces can be called out in aid of the Civil Power.

"The Canadian Forces, or any unit or other element thereof, or any officer or man, with material, are liable to be called out for service in aid of the civil power, in any case in which a riot or disturbance of the peace requiring such service occurs, or is, in the opinion of an Attorney General, considered as likely to occur, and that is beyond the powers of the civil authorities to suppress, prevent, or deal with."

The Judge Advocate General, Brigadier-General H. A. McLearn, Q.C. gave in *Canadian Defence Quarterly* (Vol. I, No. 1, summer 1971) a further elaboration on this point:

"It is clear from this provision that aid of the civil power cannot properly be invoked where a "riot" or "disturbance of the peace" is a minor incident. It is confined to cases which the Attorney General of a province considers to be "beyond the powers of the civil authorities to suppress, prevent, or deal with". It is clear that available police resources, municipal, provincial and federal, must be considered by a provincial Attorney General to be inadequate before he calls upon the Canadian Forces to participate."

In this case the response to a requisition of an Attorney General is mandatory and immediate and not subject to a policy decision by the federal government.

The Chief of the Defence Staff has discretion however as to the number of officers and men to be made available. Although the Act does not explicitly so provide, it appears that the Chief of the Defence Staff has authority in determining the size of the force to be made available to take into account other priorities and tasks of the Canadian Armed Forces. Under revised regulations dated June 26, 1970, senior members of police forces, qualified by training and experience to assess the need for action by the military, are required to accompany the officer in command of troops.

The Committee further noted that the federal Minister of Justice or Solicitor General has no power similar to the provincial Attorney General to call out armed forces in aid of the Civil Power except in the Yukon and Northwest Territories where the Attorney General of Canada is the Attorney General of those areas for local purposes.

2. Canadian Armed Forces can be used for duties in relation to federal matters for which municipal, provincial or federal police are normally responsible, but cannot deal with effectively because of other commitments. This includes such activities as the guarding of federal buildings, the protection of persons carrying out federal functions and the protection of diplomatic property and persons. It is under this power that Canadian Armed Forces can be used to control disturbances in federal penitentiaries.

3. Under Section 34 of the *National Defence Act* Canadian Armed Forces can be used in the case of disasters declared by the Governor-in-Council to be "a national concern". There has been no instance of such use and the extent to which "disaster ... of national concern" is limited to natural disasters is quite uncertain. There being no judicial interpretation to the contrary, the Committee concludes that this section of the Act might be used as a basis for use of military forces for internal security duties, although this has never happened.

4. Under English common law (although not reflected in Canadian statute law), if all else fails, the armed

forces have an obligation to maintain the fabric of society. If the effective government of a province were to be incapacitated and in consequence there was no local civil authority to take the requisite steps to obtain immediate military support, the commander of troops would be justified in taking action under the common law to maintain authority and order. However, this authority has never actually been used as a basis for employment of Canadian Armed Forces for internal security duties.

5. Under the *War Measures Act* and regulations made thereunder Canadian Armed Forces can be used for a wide variety of activities related to internal security on occasions of real or apprehended war on insurrection.

In summary the Committee has concluded that there is a considerable degree of flexibility and leeway in legal and administrative authority for use of Canadian Armed Forces in maintaining internal security even if the term "internal security" is defined in a limited sense as excluding military assistance in the specific instance of natural disasters.

While this flexibility has obvious utility the Committee emphasizes the importance of ensuring adequate protection for basic civil liberties and, equally important, effective control of the Canadian Armed Forces by civil authority in all five cases mentioned above. The Committee recommends that a study be made to determine whether it is possible to devise a consistent set of safeguards for this purpose.

The need for clarification of financial responsibilities—

Under Section 241 of the *National Defence Act* "all expenses and costs incurred by Her Majesty by reason of the Canadian Forces or any part thereof being called out...in aid of the Civil Power shall be paid to Her Majesty by the province the Attorney General of which made the requisition requiring the Canadian Forces or any part thereof to be called out." However, in the case of the provision of aid of the civil power requested by the Attorney General of Quebec in October 1970, this provision was waived by the federal government, leaving the accepted practice under this legislative provision now uncertain. The Committee has reason to believe that similar uncertainties may exist with respect to costs related to the use of Canadian Armed Forces to maintain internal security roles under other of the five legal basis noted above.

In this respect the Committee has concluded that the use of Canadian Armed Forces for the maintenance of internal security is a legitimate and appropriate responsibility of the federal government which under the basic constitutional statute is charged with responsibility for the peace, order and good government of Canada. It accordingly recommends that relevant legislation be amended to vest financial responsibility in the federal government in every case to reflect this state of affairs. Within the federal government it believes that such costs should be ultimately borne by the Department of the

Solicitor General, although it recognizes that in the first instance they would have to be covered by the Department of National Defence.

The need for clarification of the status of the Canadian serviceman—

The Committee finds there is need for some clarification as to the status of the Regular and Reserve Force serviceman who may be directly involved in carrying out internal security duties under the various authorizations possible.

Under Section 239 of the *National Defence Act*, officers and men called out in aid of the Civil Power "... shall, without further authority or appointment and without taking oath of office, be held to have and may exercise, in addition to their powers and duties as officers and men, all of the powers and duties of constables so long as they remain called out." No such authority and associated protection is automatically in force with respect to the use of armed forces personnel for internal security duties under other legal authority. However, under Bill C-2, to amend the Criminal Code, recently enacted by Parliament, military personnel being used for internal security duties under these other authorities as well as in aid of the Civil Power will be vested with the wider powers of police officers which, the Committee understands, will also provide them with legal protection that all peace officers have in exercising their responsibilities. The extent to which protection will exist will depend on the specific regulations made under the revised legislation. The Committee approves the purposes of this amendment.

However, the Committee also notes that under Section 236 of the *National Defence Act* there is no obligation for an officer or man of the Reserve Force on the Supplementary Reserve to serve in aid of the Civil Power if the terms of his involvement require him to perform duty on active service only. Presumably this applies in other cases where internal security duties are carried out. Thus, while the consent of officers and men of the Reserve Force on the Supplementary Reserve List is needed for employment in aid of the Civil Power, officers and men of the Regular Force and the Reserve Force other than those on the Supplementary Reserve List may be required to serve without their consent. The Committee further notes that an individual officer or soldier thus employed is obliged under regulations to obey lawful commands. But under the Criminal Code in a riot situation he is not responsible for what he does unless what he does, in obedience to the command of a superior, is manifestly unlawful. This leaves the serviceman in an area of double jeopardy: if he disobeys a lawful order in the belief that it is unlawful he is subject to a charge of having committed an offence under military law; and if he does obey an order—and it is an unlawful one resulting, for example, in a death—he is subject to trial in the criminal courts. The Committee understands that at present the only hope that can be offered is that judges

and juries and prosecutors will all take into account the specific circumstances of any case which might arise.

The Committee considers that this uncertainty with respect to the status of the individual serviceman is unsatisfactory. Given the increased possibility of the use of Canadian Armed Forces for internal security duties as envisaged in the White Paper—and the parallel possibility that these charged with enforcement of order may be provoked to violent action as a matter of deliberate tactic—it recommends that this ambiguous position be clarified as soon as possible.

The real utility of Canadian Armed Forces—

The White Paper states that “emergencies (may) again arise which will necessitate the Canadian Forces coming to the aid of the civil power”. (p. 11) This does not indicate in detail the specific assistance that the Canadian Armed Forces are expected to provide. The Committee believes the primary contribution of the Canadian Forces in recent instances has been trained and disciplined manpower, the symbolic value of actually bringing in the Canadian Armed Forces and the specialized training and equipment that the Canadian Forces have—particularly in communications and land and air transport. In this respect some of the comments of Mr. Smart were particularly germane:

“Military forces command today a number of skills which are of growing relevance to internal security, but only a few of those skills are uniquely or strictly military in the sense of being exclusively associated with the use of threat of potentially lethal force. In a very large number of cases, if you look at the record, military forces are only called upon for internal security duties because they constitute a reservoir of trained manpower; because they possess a highly organized command structure; because they have high mobility on land, sea and air, at long range and at short range, and because they can deploy an efficient communication system.” (Issue No. 6, page 12).

The Committee has concluded that there should be a more explicit recognition of this fact. It is important that the public recognize that primarily the armed forces are providing trained and disciplined manpower, communications, transport and other facilities rather than using weapons and threatening force, as this affects the perspective in which the Canadian Armed Forces are viewed.

Reserve Forces for internal security—

The White Paper states that “generally speaking the role of the Reserves is to support the Regular Force. In particular the Reserves provide trained officers and men for augmentation and reinforcement and they have a particularly important role in internal security contingency plans”. (p. 46) When questioned as to whether past use of armed forces for internal security operations had strained Canada’s capability of meeting other defence

commitments and whether reserve forces would be used, the Minister of National Defence added that:

“... the troops handled the crisis of 1970 very well. It does put a strain on the forces, of course, if numbers have to be moved to a particular area of Canada at a particular time.... If one had to do the same kind of operation in several places in Canada at the same time, then one would have to consider using reserve forces at that particular time”. (Issue No. 1, page 12).

The Committee subsequently received evidence that Reserve Forces would be used in internal security operations “... to the extent that the commanders of the Commands concerned considered them qualified to fulfill”. (Issue No. 18, page 19). The same departmental witness elaborated that in this regard, reserves would be used in a support function for “... (at) base or handling of logistic support for those people who are engaged in the actual front line duty.”

The Committee endorses these statements and in particular the emphasis on use of reserve forces in a support role and the importance attached to using reserves who have adequate training.

Public concern about the use of the Canadian Armed Forces for internal security—

While almost all persons submitting written briefs to your Committee expressed praise for the manner in which the Canadian Armed Forces had conducted themselves in carrying out recent internal security duties, a significant number also emphasized that in addition we must be concerned about economic, institutional and social reform to remove the causes of most threats to internal security and the proper equipping, manning and training of the regular police forces. Mr. Smart’s evidence reflected this general attitude and also pointed to dangers inherent in their use at all under certain circumstances.

“Just as any force used for internal security should think of itself as operating within and on behalf of its own national community, so then society as a whole must be able to think of a military force as its own representative, as the embodiment, if you like, of the nation in arms.” (Issue No. 6, page 11).

The Committee agrees that in principle, Canada should rely upon regular police forces to maintain internal security but that in a critical situation, the Canadian Armed Forces must, as a last resort, be available to maintain internal security. The Committee also believes if so used the period should be as brief as possible.

The Committee believes that the present manpower, training and equipment available in particular to Mobile Command is adequate for assisting in the maintenance of internal security on a relatively small scale. If unrest shows signs of increasing, the Committee believes the emphasis should be on the strengthening and im-

proved training of police forces and on removing basic causes of unrest.

In making this recommendation the Committee had also considered a third alternative, the maintenance of separate reserve police force specifically for internal security duties. This alternative had been suggested by a witness, Dr. Szabo, who said:

"... the answer obviously lies in types of police training and organizations or administrative arrangements which make it possible to use the police rather than armed forces for maintaining order in the event of mass demonstrations.

This intervention force could constitute a general reserve force which would normally be under the authority of the provincial governments.... Such a system would resolve the problem of creating a new type of organization whose expenses might unduly burden public finances." (Issue No. 4, page 7).

The basis for this recommendation was his analysis that:

"Canadian police forces are characterized first of all by their high degree of decentralization, by the fact that they are everywhere directly subject to civil authorities—to multiple civil authorities, and the channelling of responsibility is often unclear. Generally speaking, the police do not have a very high level of professional training, and, with a few exceptions, have very little training for facing the seven types of conflict which I have just described." (Issue No. 4, page 7).

The Committee believes that rather than add yet another layer of police activity within Canadian society, particularly by bearing in mind the Canadian system of government with its division of powers, it would be more effective to improve existing police forces.

THE NUCLEAR THREAT AND CIVIL DEFENCE

The White Paper states "A catastrophic war between the super powers constitutes the only major military threat to Canada. It is highly unlikely Canada would be attacked by a foreign power other than as a result of a strategic nuclear strike directed at the U.S. Our involvement would be largely a consequence of geography; Canada would not be singled out for separate attack. There is, unfortunately, not much Canada herself can do by way of effective direct defence that is of relevance against massive nuclear attack, given the present state of weapons technology, and the economic restraints on a middle power such as Canada.

Canada's overriding defence objective must therefore be the prevention of nuclear war by promoting political reconciliation to ease the underlying causes of tension, by working for arms control and disarmament agreements and by contributing to the system of stable mutual deterrents." (p. 6)

Evidence presented to the Committee indicates that properly devised civil defence measures can be effective

in reducing civilian casualties in the event of nuclear attack. Articles published in recent years by the Emergency Measures Organization have questioned the assumption that even massive nuclear attacks will necessarily result in complete destruction and have emphasized that proper measures of civil defence can be extremely effective in reducing casualties and preserving property both during the attack and in the post-attack period when law and order might break down completely in the absence of such measures.

There is no discussion whatsoever of civil defence in the 1971 White Paper. The previous White Paper published in March, 1964 did refer to this subject and included the following statement:

"As has been indicated, the future priority to be assigned to civil defence measures will be influenced greatly by the decision to deploy or not to deploy an anti-ICBM system. Until this major decision has been taken, it is not possible to resolve a large number of lesser policy matters in the civil defence field. In the meantime, approved projects will be completed and maintained."

Since decisions with regard to the anti-ICBM system have now been made and in view of the importance of the subject as indicated above, the Committee urges that the Government undertake a complete review of the relevance and importance of civil defence in relation to its defence policy, the priority which should be accorded to it, the responsibility for it and the funds to be devoted to it.

The Committee agrees that Canada's overriding defence objective must be the prevention of nuclear war and with the emphasis placed by the White Paper upon promoting political reconciliation to ease underlying causes of tension and working for arms control and disarmament agreements. However, bearing in mind Canada's very limited defence budget in relation to the nuclear budgets of the United States of America, the Soviet Union and other nuclear powers, it does not consider that Canada can usefully make any very substantial financial contribution to the system of stable mutual nuclear deterrence except to the extent that this results indirectly from the performance of other roles. In fact, the Committee was reassured by the assertion of the Minister of National Defence that the reference in the White Paper to contributing to the system of stable mutual deterrence was meant to refer to Canada's existing warning system and anti-bomber and anti-submarine forces rather than to any new contributions to the system of stable mutual deterrence.

STATUS AND ROLE OF RESERVE FORCES

The White Paper on Defence states that "Historically the reserve forces have always made a significant contribution to the total strength of Canada's Armed Forces and have played an important role in many military endeavours in both peace and war.... The Government intends to maintain the Reserve Force at the current

authorized size and to continue to depend upon it for an appropriate share of the manpower needs of the Canadian Armed Forces." (p. 44)

However, it adds that "The present Reserve Force has been designated as part of the forces in being. Therefore the composition must be adjusted from time to time to keep pace with changes in overall force manpower and cannot be considered in isolation from the Regular Force. In addition many members of the Reserve Force, by virtue of their civilian occupations will not always be immediately available in time of emergency. Furthermore only the Regulars have adequate time to train for the more sophisticated activities and consequently the ratio of Regular to Reservist must be much higher than it has been at other times in our history." (p. 45)

A Defence Department witness, giving evidence to the Committee on Reserve Forces, has however elaborated that:

"The acceptance of the nuclear deterrent and the philosophy of collective security have led to the major portion of our defence dollars going to the regular force, to the forces-in-being concept. This force has to be manned, equipped and ready to respond at all times. However, with progress on SALT and MBFR that we have been seeing in recent days the threat of nuclear war may hopefully decrease, albeit in the first instance more emphasis will be placed on possible conventional activities than was the case in 1969. In addition, increased emphasis is being placed on sovereignty, including internal security and aid to the Civil Power..."

"...These commitments plus our new orientation towards community development projects may tend to place more emphasis on the reserve force than was the case as little as three years ago. The reserve force then appears to be on the threshold of assuming new levels of importance in our ongoing defence activities." (Issue No. 18, page 7)

In the light of the apparent inconsistency in the evidence received, the Committee is uncertain what significance the government intends the Reserves to have in the overall design of Canadian defence capabilities and believes that this point should be clarified.

The Committee notes a discrepancy between the apparent emphasis given to making increased use of the Reserve Forces and the shortage of resources to maintain them and the consequent difficulty of retaining personnel. Further the Reserves presently available do not appear to be used as effectively as is possible.

The Committee was struck—both in Ottawa and during its visit to bases in Western and Northern Canada—including informal discussion with major General Reserves—by the severe budgetary limitations within which the Reserves now have to operate. Due to the similar budgetary limitations applying to the Regular Force, the Committee understands that the availability of Regular Forces for training reserves has been affected. With

respect to naval reserves, evidence was received from the Department of National Defence that, although the reserve was becoming increasingly self-sufficient, reduction in the regular force had resulted in "...reduction in regular force levels of instruction (for Reserves) in fleet schools; fewer reserve sea training billets; and reduced administrative capability to update naval reserve course training standards and course material." (Issue No. 18, page 12)

In a more fundamental sense the Committee observes that, while an argument for the maintenance of regular "forces-in-being" has been advanced in the past, a rationale for reserve forces in the same nuclear-age context has been lacking. However, the Committee understands that Mobile Command has now been directed to review their assigned (land element) reserves to develop policies applicable to the 1972-80 time frame, and that the first part dealing with "...the philosophical side... which includes the review of missions, roles, tasks and concepts" has already been completed. A similar review is being made of the naval and air reserves and a Departmental witness has testified that "meaningful and appropriate" decisions are anticipated by the end of this year. The Committee commends the timeliness of these studies and wishes to stress the importance of wide publicity so that the Canadian public can clearly appreciate the relevance of reserve forces in the 1970's. (Issue No. 18, page 7)

PERSONNEL AND RANK STRUCTURE

Evidence received by the Committee during its tour of western and northern defence bases indicated a possible shortage of personnel in certain sectors. This is directly related to the question as to whether the best possible use is now being made of the personnel now authorized.

The Estimates of the Department of National Defence for the 1972-73 fiscal year indicate that out of a force of approximately 83,000 men, the Canadian Armed Forces have a total of 97 personnel with the rank of Brigadier General or above, over 1,100 Colonels and Lieutenant Colonels, over 2,700 Majors, almost 7,000 Captains, over 2,300 Lieutenants and over 1,800 Officer Cadets. There are 816 Chief Warrant Officers, over 2,300 Master Warrant Officers, 4,600 Warrant Officers, 10,200 Sergeants, almost 34,000 Corporals and slightly less than 15,000 private soldiers.

It will be noted that with a total strength of 83,000 men, the Canadian Armed Forces now include over 15,000 commissioned officers including officer cadets and that there are relatively few private soldiers in relation to the number of non-commissioned officers.

On the other hand it is recognized that Canada has a professional army which requires high technical qualifications in many of its branches, promotions in rank are often necessary in order to retain trained personnel and that a trained cadre is necessary in order to provide for rapid expansion in event of emergency. It is also recog-

nized that a large number of civilians are employed by the Department of National Defence.

The Committee therefore urges the Government to review the distribution of Personnel and the rank structure with a view to making certain that the best possible use is made of the personnel of the armed forces and that the rank structure is appropriate.

USE OF SUFFIELD MILITARY RESERVE FOR TANK TRAINING

The White Paper notes that Canada has reached an agreement with Great Britain for the use of training facilities and areas in Canada, and that:

"The Government believes that Canada, in providing these facilities, can make an additional valuable contribution to the effectiveness of NATO. Negotiations for such an agreement are based on the principle that the cost should be borne by the user country." (p. 38)

The agreement with Britain, ratified by the Canadian Government on August 25, 1971, permits the United Kingdom Forces to use a portion of the Suffield Military reserve for armoured, infantry and artillery live firing for a ten year period. The training area used by the British is under the command and control of the Canadian Armed Forces and the whole plan is conducted within the provisions of the Visiting Forces Act and the NATO Status of Forces Agreement. Training of British troops began in June 1972 with consecutive groups of 600 to 1,000 training in the area for three week periods, using equipment permanently located at Suffield. There is a small permanent British staff.

The Committee received a written brief and heard oral evidence from representatives of the National and Provincial Parks Association who expressed concern about the impact of the training operations on the ecology of the land and stressed the value of archeological sites in the area.

During its subsequent visit to the CFB Suffield, the Committee was briefed by the Commanding Officer, by the Commandant of the Training Unit and by the Archeological Survey Force Supervisor now resident on the site for the summer.

It was told that protective measures had been taken based on studies and recommendations by the Canadian Wildlife Service of the Department of the Environment and agreed to by the various federal authorities concerned with this area. In summary, the following steps have been taken to ensure that those areas of ecological and archeological significance are protected:

- British training will be confined to parts of the reserve where soil conditions are most resistant to traffic damage;
- the most vulnerable area, the Middle Sand Hills, in the northeast corner of the reserve, will be closed entirely to troops;

- a one-mile buffer zone will be established along the South Saskatchewan River with the exception of a river crossing site known as Drowning Ford;

- off-road traffic will be limited to movement on foot in a third area in the southeast part of the reserve. It contains some relatively undisturbed grassland that is close to the original state of virgin prairie.

The Committee was informed that the Museum of Man is delineating historical and archeological sites and objects in the area and steps will be taken to protect these. A continuing survey and monitoring program will be developed for both ecological and environmental reasons, and environmental experts have been named to advise the Base Commander in these matters.

The Commandant at the British training unit is fully aware of the importance of such protection. The Commander of CFB Suffield is also providing support facilities to the Archeological Survey Force supervisor and the twenty-four students currently involved in his survey of the area. The Committee is satisfied that serious efforts are being made to protect both the ecology of the area and sites of possible archeological value. However, the Committee believes the situation should be kept under continuous review.

ROLES AND BUDGET

Evidence presented to the Committee would indicate that the change in Canada's primary defence priorities as well as the increased emphasis on the use of Canadian Armed Forces for national development tasks, provision of other assistance to civil authorities and for internal security duties, all within the framework of a fixed defence budget have strained the present resources of the Department of National Defence. In this situation, the Committee recommends that the Government review the various alternatives. As indicated earlier in the report there are a number of possibilities including a reduction in the roles assigned to the Canadian Armed Forces, a lowering of the state of operational readiness for military commitments, a more efficient allocation of equipment, facilities and personnel and an increase in the defence budget.

Another possibility would be to allow the Department of National Defence to recover directly the costs it incurs in providing assistance to civil authorities and the private sector. At present most of the money actually recovered for provision of such assistance goes directly to the consolidated revenue fund. Alternatively, the Government might consider maintaining larger and more active Reserve Forces. Such an alternative, however, would require greater co-operation from the private and public sectors in allowing reservists time off work.

Without attempting to specify in this interim report which of these possibilities would be most desirable, the Committee does wish to emphasize its belief that the Armed Forces as presently constituted are at times strained to the limit to carry out the broad range of

roles and tasks assigned to them and corrective action is required.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19*) is tabled.

(The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 36 to the Journals).

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a third time and do pass.

And on the motion of Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mrs. MacInnis, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-170 be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs for the purpose of reconsidering the portions of Clause 6 and of such other clauses that impose a means or income test for the receipt of benefits under the said Bill.

After further debate, on motion of Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), seconded by Mr. MacEachen, the said debate was adjourned.

Bill C-215, An Act to amend the Pension Act, as reported from the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, was concurred in at the report stage.

Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs of Bill S-3, An Act to change the names of the Territorial Court of the Yukon Territory and the Territorial Court of the Northwest Territories;

Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and, by unanimous consent, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment, and concurred in at the report stage.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

The Order being read for the third reading of Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act;

Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of Bill C-203, An Act to amend the Representation Commissioner Act;

Mr. MacEachen for Mr. Pelletier, seconded by Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and, by unanimous consent, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment, and concurred in at the report stage.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Olson, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.04 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Laflamme for Mr. Breau on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Peters for Mr. Brewin on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Benson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of Defence Construction (1951) Limited, including its Accounts and Financial Statements for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/120.

By Mr. Chrétien, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Northern Canada Power Commission for the year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 24 of the Northern Canada Power Commission Act, chapter N-21, R.S.C., 1970, together with the report of the Auditor General, on the accounts and financial statement, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/196.

By Mr. Drury, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the National Research Council of Canada, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 16 of the National Research Council Act, chapter

N-14, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/192.

By Mr. Drury,—Report of Canadian Patents and Development Limited, including its Accounts and Financial Statements and the Auditor General's Report thereon, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/104.

By Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Army Benevolent Fund Board for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 13 of the Army Benevolent Fund Act, chapter A-16, R.S.C., 1970, including its Accounts and Financial Statements. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/58.

By Mr. Macdonald, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Atomic Energy Control Board, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 20(1) of the Atomic Energy Control Act, chapter A-19, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/61.

By Mr. Munro, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Annual Report respecting Operations of the Medical Care Act, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 9 of the Medical Care Act, chapter M-8, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/298.

By Mr. Munro,—Report of the Medical Research Council for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, including a Statement of Expenditure pursuant to section 17 of the Medical Research Council Act, chapter M-9, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/299.

At 10.29 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11:00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 85

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, JUNE 30, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Hales, from the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented the Third Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Thursday, May 11, 1972, your Committee has considered the Auditor General's Report for the year ended March 31, 1969 and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the Third Session of the 28th Parliament in relation thereto.

The following relates to Paragraph 55 of the aforementioned Auditor General's Report entitled "*Failure of a Crown corporation to deduct and remit employees' taxes and to pay other contributions to the United States Government.*"

The Committee assigned responsibility for detailed study of this paragraph to a Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Mr. Norman Cafik, M.P. The Subcommittee met a number of times as detailed in its report hereunder, and in addition your Committee discussed this paragraph at fifteen meetings.

The Report of the Subcommittee adopted by the Committee with amendments, reads as follows:

On Thursday, February 18, 1971, pursuant to the Standing Committee's consideration of Paragraph 55 of the

Auditor General's 1969 Report, it was agreed to form a Subcommittee as follows: Mr. Cafik, Chairman, and Messrs. Crouse and Mather as other members. The same members were appointed in this Session on May 18, 1972.

It was further agreed that the Committee seek authority to retain the services of legal counsel. The Committee requested such authorization in its Fourth Report to the House of Commons of February 22, 1971 which was concurred in on February 25, 1971.

Meetings of the Subcommittee were held on February 22, March 25, April 11, May 4, December 16, 1971 and June 20, 1972, and the following persons appeared before the Subcommittee as witnesses:

From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation:

Dr. G. F. Davidson, President; Mr. V. F. Davies, Vice-President Finance; Mr. Jacques Alleyn, General Counsel; Mr. G. A. Flaherty, Assistant General Counsel; Mr. G. Quinn, Tax Accountant.

From the Department of National Revenue (Taxation):

Mr. C. W. Mavor, Director, Provincial and International Relations Division.

From the Auditor General's Office:

Mr. E. Cooke, Audit Director; Mr. I. A. M. Buzza, Assistant Audit Director.

Also assisting the Committee were:

Mr. J. A. Coates, Legal Counsel; Mr. E. R. Adams, Research Branch, Library of Parliament.

The Report is presented in two parts:

Part I—Background, Summary and Events

Part II—Committee's conclusions and recommendations

PART I

Background Summary of Events

For several years prior to 1958 the status of foreign governmental organizations in the United States had been under review by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. On July 15, 1958 a certificate was issued by this U.S. authority in which the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation continued to be exempted from United States income tax pursuant to Section 892 of the Internal Revenue Code; and its employees, alien to the United States, continued to be exempted from Federal income tax on their compensation for services performed in the United States for the Corporation, if certification was made as required by Section 893 of the Code. Extensions to these exemptions were granted annually to the Corporation up until June 30, 1961.

Prior to 1961 the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and its employees resident in the United States were taxed under Canadian income tax laws as "deemed residents of Canada" and as "officers or servants of Her Majesty". On September 6, 1958 the Canadian Parliament passed a new Broadcasting Act in which the Corporation was described as "an agent of Her Majesty", while its employees were no longer deemed "officers or servants of Her Majesty". The Corporation continued to make Canadian income tax remittances for its employees in the United States until May 1, 1965.

Thus, at the beginning of 1962, the tax status of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and its employees in the United States had become uncertain in the minds of several officers of the Corporation and opinions were sought from the Department of National Revenue and the American Consul in Ottawa. On March 19, 1962 the American Consul indicated in a letter that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was not believed to be performing a governmental function within the meaning of Article VI of the Canada-U.S. Income Tax Treaty and that its employees in the United States would be subject to U.S. income taxes. Correspondence from the Department of National Revenue in May and June of 1962 revealed that under Section 139(3) of the Income Tax Act and the 1958 Broadcasting Act, CBC employees were not subject to Canadian income tax; and they also indicated that they may not be exempt from U.S. income tax under Article VI of the Tax Treaty.

On September 12, 1962, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was advised by the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa, that the issuance of the annual order recognizing the status of the CBC was being "held in abeyance" because of the current review by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service. It was not until the following year, on September 25, 1963, that officers of the CBC met with representatives of the Departments of External Affairs and Finance to clarify the Corporation's status in the United States under the Canadian Income Tax and Broadcasting Acts. No decisions or definite plans to amend legislation or change the status quo were made at this or subsequent meetings.

Almost a year later, in August 1964, the Department of National Revenue requested from the Department of Justice a legal opinion on the status of CBC employees abroad for income tax purposes. On November 3, 1964 the Associate Deputy Minister of Justice replied with an opinion that an employee of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was not an officer or servant of Canada within the meaning of Section 139(3)(c)(i) of the Income Tax Act. Accordingly, he was not deemed to be resident in Canada and, if he met none of the other relevant tests of residence, he was not subject to tax under Part I of the Income Tax Act. The Department of National Revenue transmitted this ruling in a letter to the CBC on April 2, 1965. On May 1 the Corporation ceased to remit Canadian income tax from employees resident abroad.

In a letter dated June 17, 1965 to CBC representatives in London, Paris, New York and Washington, the Acting Director of Personnel and Organization conveyed the above ruling and policy decision to discontinue the deduction of Canadian income tax for foreign-based employees. A corporate proposal for voluntary tax deduction was also made, but was not accepted by the employees concerned and was subsequently abandoned in the same year. In the interim, between the proposal and its non-acceptance by the employees, the CBC in fact continued to make deductions from its U.S.-based employees at the same level as Canadian income tax rates, and had this money kept in trust. It was later returned in the same year (1965) when the employees opted out of this proposal.

On March 6, 1967 the U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue ruled that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was "not exempt from Federal income tax pursuant to Section 892 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954... that employees, alien to the United States were not exempt from Federal income tax on their compensation for services performed in the United States for the Corporation". This ruling was not finally transmitted to the CBC by the Department of External Affairs until July 24, 1967.

During 1967 new Canadian broadcasting legislation was being prepared in which the Corporation was no longer being considered as an agent of Her Majesty. Discussions subsequently took place in Ottawa in November 1967 between officers of the CBC and representatives of the Departments of External Affairs, Finance and National

Revenue to discuss the Corporation's response to the Internal Revenue Service ruling of March 6, 1967 and its overall ramifications in relation to other Canadian Government agencies operating in the United States. After a meeting with the Internal Revenue Service representative in Ottawa on November 24, 1967, it was proposed that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should meet with the U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue and request reconsideration of the ruling on the basis that while the CBC might have some of the appearances of an "ordinary domestic corporation", the true nature of its operations was so different as to render the ruling inappropriate. Finally, it was decided that a direct approach to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was advisable and a meeting was held in Washington on January 23, 1968.

At this meeting the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation proposed the reconsideration of the March 6, 1967 ruling, and suggested that if it were upheld it should be applied only with effect from January 1, 1968. The Commissioner thereupon undertook to review his earlier ruling.

During 1968 discussions took place in Ottawa and Washington between CBC representatives and officers of the Departments of External Affairs, Finance and National Revenue and the U.S. Internal Revenue Service on the possibility of reciprocal treatment for U.S. Government agencies in Canada. No solutions were advanced. By late 1968 it became clear that the ruling of March 6, 1967 would not be changed and this was confirmed on April 15, 1969. The only question that remained unresolved was the extent of retroactivity.

At a meeting in Washington on May 12, 1969 the Corporation agreed to institute tax deductions at source for its employees resident in the United States, effective January 1, 1969; to hold discussions on the retroactivity of the March 1967 ruling; and to determine and settle any liability.

Tax deductions at source were instituted immediately and made effective as of January 1, 1969. By early August a tentative agreement was reached between the Corporation and the Internal Revenue Service on the retroactive date of April 1, 1966; and on a total corporate liability of \$119,000 U.S. less a tax credit of \$67,000 U.S. in respect of monies withheld on a 1964 sale of CBC program material. This was confirmed by letter on August 15 by the Corporation and later ratified by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on October 10, 1969.

On August 30, 1969 the Corporation was advised by the Internal Revenue Service of an additional tax liability of \$15,000 U.S. in respect of one employee whose payments had been overlooked. Thus, by October 10, 1969 the final tax liability of the Corporation for the period April 1, 1966 to December 31, 1968 was calculated at \$134,573.99 U.S. On February 6, 1970 the Corporation received from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service a notice of adjustment and receipted notices of assessment in respect of the complete discharge of the liability.

There were no attempts by the Corporation during this period to recover the above tax payments from its employees. In May 1969 payroll deduction procedures were instituted retroactive to January 1, 1969 to ensure that the required deductions were made from the salary cheques of those employees resident in the United States and remitted to the U.S. authorities in accordance with U.S. tax law.

PART II

Subcommittee's Conclusions

The following paragraphs outline the major conclusions and recommendations of the Subcommittee, resulting from its hearings and investigations.

1. Legislative Changes

When the CBC was established by the 1936 legislation, the Act was silent as to the status of the Corporation and its employees. Consequently, those employees of the CBC who had been appointed under the Civil Service Act continued to enjoy the same conditions and benefits contained in that Act. As officers or servants of Her Majesty, CBC employees for tax purposes were deemed residents of Canada under Section 139(3) of the Income Tax Act, even though they might be living and working in another country.

Additionally, prior to June 30, 1961 the U.S. tax authorities considered the CBC employees working in the United States as employees of a foreign government and, pursuant to Sections 892 and 893 of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code, had granted income tax exemption to the Corporation and its U.S. employees.

The Broadcasting Act of 1958 clarified the status of CBC employees; it specifically stated that the Corporation was "an agent of Her Majesty" and that its employees were "not officers or servants of Her Majesty". This latter qualification of the Act, the Subcommittee believes, contributed to the subsequent problems experienced by the CBC with the U.S. tax authorities. For, when the Corporation applied for its traditional tax exemption in January 1962, they were subsequently advised that the status of the CBC as an instrumentality of a foreign government was under review and that the annual order was being "held in abeyance". The Subcommittee can only assume that the U.S. tax authorities had finally become aware of the change in status of the CBC employees as stated in the 1958 Act, and were now questioning the status of the Corporation as an instrumentality of a foreign government in accordance with Article VI of the Canada-United States of America Tax Treaty.

Therefore, the Subcommittee concludes:—

1. That the Canadian Broadcasting Legislation of 1958 may have contributed to an alteration of the tax status of the CBC employees in the U.S. from a tax-exempt position in the U.S. to a taxable position in the U.S.

2. Corporation's Tax Status

Although the 1958 Act may have activated a study of the CBC's corporate status in the United States, the decision of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue Service, dated March 6, 1967, was based on whether the Corporation was performing a governmental function within the meaning of Article VI of the Canada-United States of America Tax Treaty and was eligible for tax exemption pursuant to Section 892 of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The ruling was not founded on the taxable status of the CBC employees in the U.S. and was not related in any way to the fact that CBC employees were no longer officers or servants of Her Majesty. As stated in the Commissioner's letter, the objects, functions and activities as described in Section 8 of the 1936 Canadian Broadcasting Act and later repeated in Section 29 of the 1958 Broadcasting Act, "customarily are attributable to and carried on by private enterprise for profit in the United States... even though in some instances governments are also engaged in the same or similar activity". On these grounds, the CBC was deemed not exempt from U.S. income tax under Section 892 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The CBC has maintained that if they had commenced making tax deductions at source from their employees in the U.S. or had held that money in escrow, or in fact had remitted it to the Internal Revenue Service, the Corporation would have jeopardized its tax-exempt position in the United States by such action. Furthermore, they have argued that their action not to deduct taxes at source was founded on the knowledge that anticipated legislative changes on corporate status, which in fact never took place, would have changed their case before the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The Subcommittee understands these arguments and their importance. However, in retrospect it is evident to the Subcommittee that the CBC was found to be a taxable Corporation in the United States as a corporate entity and that its employees were also considered to be taxable as individuals.

The Subcommittee believes that arguments put forward by the Corporation, in respect to the relationship between the employees' taxable position and the Corporation's tax status, are not, in retrospect, justifiable.

The Subcommittee understands how the CBC may have felt that there may have been a relationship between the two questions, but nonetheless, we feel that the judgment made by the CBC in this connection, at that time, was a significant step towards exposing the CBC to a corporate liability, which was unacceptable.

Therefore, the Subcommittee concludes:—

2. That the CBC should have based its decision on existing legislation and regulations rather than delaying action pending possible changes.

3. That the CBC should have consulted legal counsel in May, 1965 to determine what connection there was between action taken by the Corporation regarding employee deductions and the tax status of the Corporation itself.

4. That the CBC, although understandably preoccupied with its corporate tax status in the U.S., clearly failed to give adequate consideration to its potential corporate liability regarding employee deductions.

3. Employees' Tax Status

The Subcommittee observes that it was about seven years after the 1958 broadcasting legislation when the CBC received a correct ruling from the Canadian Department of National Revenue on the tax status of CBC employees working in the United States. On April 2, 1965, in a letter to the Corporation, the Department of National Revenue ruled that under Section 139(3) of the Income Tax Act a CBC employee performing services outside of Canada was not a servant of Canada and not subject to Canadian income tax.

On May 1, 1965, the Corporation ceased to remit tax deductions to the Canadian Income Tax authorities for its U.S. based employees and commenced holding a similar amount of money in trust to provide a fund out of which employees' potential liabilities would be paid. In an internal memorandum dated June 17, 1965, those employees were given the option of authorizing the trust account deductions or opting out of this approach. It appears that the established trust account approach was abandoned in that same year because employees opted out. The monies accumulated in the trust account were returned to the individual employees.

The Subcommittee is of the view that the CBC's action of June 17, 1965 was inadequate. The memorandum of that date dealt only with the potential problem of the employees. The Subcommittee commends the Corporation for such interest in its staff, however, it is convinced that it should have exercised the same degree of concern for its corporate position.

The Subcommittee understands that the CBC sought advice from its own legal counsel respecting legal justification for holding funds in trust for its employees—it should have, at the same time, directed its counsel's attention to the question of exposing the Corporation to a potential liability. It is the view of the Subcommittee that legal counsel at that time would have been in a position to suggest legal ways by which the Corporation could assure itself that any liability to which it was being exposed could have been recovered from the employees themselves.

In addition, the Subcommittee is not satisfied that there was adequate documentation of the response to the memorandum of June 17, 1965 nor is it satisfied that adequate follow-up procedures were implemented.

Therefore, the Subcommittee concludes:—

5. That the Corporation's action taken in its memorandum of June 17, 1965, was designed solely and ex-

clusively to provide a fund for use by employees in the event that they were held personally liable for U.S. tax.

6. That follow-up action to the memorandum of June 17, 1965, was inadequate.

7. That the Corporation's action in 1965 was seriously inadequate in terms of taking steps to avoid exposing itself to a corporate liability without having made provisions to recover the funds from its employees.

4. CBC's Remuneration Policy

According to its remuneration policy the CBC pays its employees in foreign countries equivalent salaries and allowances to those earned in Canada in the light of Canadian taxation. Because of higher taxation in the U.S., primarily resulting from the non-taxable allowance (permitted in Canada but not permitted in the U.S.) the CBC has argued that it would have cost the Corporation the sum of \$225,000 U.S. for the same period in adjusted salary and expense allowances if it had been paying taxes in the U.S. Therefore, in the Corporation's view, its decision not to deduct U.S. taxes at source in May 1965 saved the Corporation \$91,000 U.S.

The Subcommittee does not question the validity of these calculations. However, if it is the policy of the CBC to pay funds in a foreign country equivalent to the individual's earnings in Canada, the Subcommittee argues that this principle ought to be applied in both directions. In other words, if an employee ends up with less net income in a foreign country because of local taxes, it is agreed that his income should be adjusted to compensate for the difference. However, in the event of an employee having greater net income in a foreign country because of lower taxes, the Subcommittee believes that the same principle ought to apply and that his income ought to be reduced accordingly.

The CBC did not take any action in May, 1965 to protect itself against corporate liability by securing agreement from its employees in the United States to reimburse the Corporation for payments that may be subsequently made on their behalf. The Subcommittee is of the view that it should have, under such circumstances, reduced the allowances paid to its U.S. employees reflecting the recognition that they were presumed to be taxable neither in the U.S. nor in Canada between May 1, 1965 and December 31, 1968. By so doing, there would have been a sizeable reduction in payroll expenditures, which would have largely offset the liability which the Corporation ultimately paid in respect to non-deductions of U.S. taxes for these employees.

The Subcommittee has not taken into account in the foregoing suggestion any possible difficulties which could have arisen for the Corporation in respect to labour relations, and bases its judgement on the understanding that its recommendation is consistent with present CBC remuneration policy.

Therefore, the Subcommittee concludes:—

8. In light of the fact that the employees were not asked to assume the responsibility to reimburse the Cor-

poration for any tax liability resulting from non-deduction of U.S. taxes, the Corporation should have reduced allowances paid to such employees by the amount of the Canadian income tax no longer being withheld.

9. That the CBC should review its application of its remuneration policy to insure allowances are adjusted in both directions in an equitable manner.

5. Tax Settlement

The Subcommittee wishes to commend the CBC management for the efficient manner in which it negotiated the final tax settlement with the U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The Subcommittee feels that the CBC had exposed itself to a much greater liability than it, in fact, had to pay. Fortunately, due to the successful negotiations carried on by the senior management, the estimated liability of \$225,000 U.S. was not paid; instead, a final settlement of \$134,573.99 U.S. was reached resulting in a reduction of \$91,000 U.S.

6. Recovery of Tax Payments

From a legalistic standpoint some maintain that it is uncertain whether the payment to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service constituted a corporate fine for the non-deduction of taxes, or in fact was a final settlement for the Corporation's indebtedness to the U.S. authorities for its U.S. employees.

If the amount paid was a corporate fine for the non-deduction of taxes, then such a payment may not have relieved the individual employees working in the U.S. of their U.S. tax liabilities. They were, and possibly still are, liable for personal income taxes for the period in question. If this is the correct legal interpretation, then the Corporation may have no legal or moral grounds for recovering the monies paid by it to the U.S. Treasury from the individuals concerned.

If, however, the settlement of the Corporation's liability to the U.S. Treasury had in fact relieved these individuals of their U.S. tax obligations for the period in question, the Subcommittee believes that the CBC should have taken steps to recover the monies from the employees concerned because, in effect, they received a benefit from such a settlement.

Because there was some uncertainty over the legality of the settlement payment as to whether it was a corporate fine or a tax payment on behalf of its U.S. employees, the CBC did not wish to proceed with the recovery of the funds at the time. However, in February 1971, at the request of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, the CBC sought a legal opinion from the Department of Justice.

In a letter dated November 15, 1971 that Department informed the CBC that it did not have "any reasonable chance of succeeding in recovering, by way of legal proceedings against its employees, any amount in respect of the portion of the payment (\$134,573 U.S.) which it paid to the Government of the United States which can reasonably be attributed to the liability which arose

on its failure to withhold the appropriate deductions pursuant to Section 3402 of the Internal Revenue Code at the time remuneration was paid to its employees”.

New York counsel, Messrs. Sullivan and Cromwell, who were consulted by the Canadian Department of Justice, argue that if no tax under Section 3402 of the Code (Income Tax) was withheld from wages paid to the CBC's U.S. employees between 1966 and 1968, no credit appears to be available to the employees under the literal terms of Section 31(a) of the Code. Furthermore, no judicial or administrative interpretations of that Section in this context has so far been published. They conclude therefore that “it is impossible to predict with any confidence” whether a less than literal view might be taken by a U.S. court or by the Internal Revenue Service as an administrative matter, although there is much to be said from the viewpoint of sound administration of the revenue laws in favour of allowing a credit in these circumstances.

This view goes beyond the statement made by the Director of International Operations, Internal Revenue Service, to the CBC which stated:

“that the payment has not relieved the individuals resident in the U.S. of their statutory liability to file tax returns and make payment of any liability”.

In respect to Social Security Tax, it is Sullivan and Cromwell's considered view that the amounts paid by the CBC in 1969 with respect to its liability for the tax imposed under Section 3101 of the Code, should be construed as *pro tanto* reductions of the liability of its employees for this tax, even although no tax deductions from payments of wages were made between 1966 and 1968.

Their comments in respect to recovery indicate that the U.S. Internal Revenue Code does not provide for any independent legal basis for a cause of action by an employer against an employee to recover any portion of the remuneration paid to him in contravention of this Section. They indicate that such a basis would have to be found in the general law of the relevant State within which the employee is a resident at the time remuneration was paid to him.

The legal dilemma in which the CBC now finds itself in respect to recovery of funds is indeed unfortunate and is a direct result of not taking adequate action initially. There is no doubt in the Subcommittee's mind that had the CBC given as close attention to its own corporate position as it gave to the employees potential difficulties, the loss of Corporation funds could have been avoided.

In testimony, the CBC itself agreed with the Subcommittee that it would have been a reasonable course of action for the Corporation back in 1965 to have secured from its employees a legal commitment to assume the liability to which the Corporation was exposing itself on their behalf.

The Subcommittee has taken into consideration the arguments in respect to the possibility of recovering funds

from the employees concerned, and after discussions with its own legal counsel have concluded that there are ways and means open to the Corporation by which it can seek recovery.

In light of the legal question as to whether the money paid by the CBC in fact relieved the individuals of a tax liability to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, the Subcommittee considers it advisable for the CBC, in the event of recovery from its employees to enter into an agreement with such employees that the Corporation assumes responsibility for payment of any tax claim in respect to the period in question made by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service against the employees in question. This step would assure the employees who agreed to reimburse the CBC for its payment that they would be relieved of any further obligation. The Subcommittee believes as a result of this investigation that no such claim will in fact ever be made by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service against such employees because the amounts have been paid by the CBC.

The Subcommittee notes that of the 17 employees originally involved, 13 of them are still employees of the CBC, 7 working in Canada, 4 in the U.S. and 2 abroad. This is an important factor to be borne in mind when considering methods of recovery.

The Subcommittee strongly criticizes the CBC for not having approached its employees in an attempt to recover the \$134,573.99 prior to this time. The Subcommittee believes that the Corporation should take steps to achieve recovery as soon as possible. A number of courses of action are open to the CBC.

In the first instance, the CBC should approach the 13 individuals currently under its employ with a view to seeking their agreement to reimburse the Corporation for the monies paid on their behalf to the Internal Revenue Service. It does not appear to the Subcommittee that such an approach would impose an onerous obligation upon the individuals, for in the view of the Subcommittee, they clearly received an unusual benefit at the Canadian taxpayers' expense.

The Subcommittee believes that such employees, when acquainted with the facts surrounding the case, would assume their responsibility and agree to allow the Corporation to make deductions at source from current incomes over an extended period of time which would not impose any undue hardship for the individuals concerned.

The Subcommittee also believes that the same approach should be made to the 4 former employees so that a voluntary agreement to repay the funds can be reached.

It is significant to note that in the event of successful recovery from the employees of the \$134,573.99, the 17 employees involved still would not have paid tax in the United States or in Canada for the period between May 1, 1965 and April 1, 1966.

In addition to this, all Canadian employees of the CBC working in the United States who paid Canadian taxes up

until May 1, 1965 were eligible for a rebate of such taxes from the Department of National Revenue. Information is not available to the Subcommittee as to whether in fact such individuals sought or received a refund of such taxes.

Failing the above approach, the Subcommittee believes that there are a number of alternate courses that can be taken by the CBC in respect to recovery of funds. The Subcommittee does not wish to outline details of these legal and other approaches until an approach has been made by the Corporation to the individuals concerned along the lines outlined in this report.

Therefore, the Subcommittee concludes:

10. That the payment made to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service by the CBC for its failure to remit income tax for its U.S. based employees between April 1, 1966 and December 31, 1968, constitutes a beneficial payment in respect to each employee.

11. That the payment to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service for non-deduction and remittance of social security tax regarding its U.S. based employees constitutes a beneficial payment to such persons.

12. That the CBC should have attempted to make recovery for these sums from the employees concerned through direct negotiation with the employees concerned.

13. That the CBC should immediately take steps to attempt to recover the \$134,573.99 from the 17 employees involved.

7. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

The following are the Subcommittee's major conclusions and recommendations:

1. That the Canadian Broadcasting Legislation of 1958 may have contributed to an alteration of the tax status of the CBC employees in the U.S. from a tax-exempt position in the U.S. to a taxable position in the U.S.

2. That the CBC should have based its decision on existing legislation and regulations rather than delaying action pending possible changes.

3. That the CBC should have consulted legal counsel in May, 1965 to determine what connection there was between action taken by the Corporation regarding employee deductions and the tax status of the Corporation itself.

4. That the CBC, although understandably preoccupied with its corporate tax status in the U.S., clearly failed to give adequate consideration to its potential corporate liability regarding employee deductions.

5. That the Corporation's action taken in its memorandum of June 17, 1965, was designed solely and exclusively to provide a fund for use by employees in the event that they were held personally liable for U.S. tax.

6. That follow-up action to the memorandum of June 17, 1965, was inadequate.

7. That the Corporation's action in 1965 was seriously inadequate in terms of taking steps to avoid exposing itself to a corporate liability without having made provisions to recover the funds from its employees.

8. In light of the fact that the employees were not asked to assume the responsibility to reimburse the Corporation for any tax liability resulting from non-deduction of U.S. taxes, the Corporation should have reduced allowances paid to such employees by the amount of the Canadian income tax no longer being withheld.

9. That the CBC should review its application of its remuneration policy to insure allowances are adjusted in both directions in an equitable manner.

10. That the payment made to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service by the CBC for its failure to remit income tax for its U.S. based employees between April 1, 1966 and December 31, 1968, constitutes a beneficial payment in respect to each employee.

11. That the payment to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service for non-deduction and remittance of social security tax regarding its U.S. based employees constitutes a beneficial payment to such persons.

12. That the CBC should have attempted to make recovery for these sums from the employees concerned through direct negotiation with the employees concerned.

13. That the CBC should immediately take steps to attempt to recover the \$134,573.99 from the 17 employees involved.

* * * * *

The Committee endorses the conclusions and recommendations of the Subcommittee and thanks its Chairman and members.

The Committee appreciates the cooperation it has received from the CBC officials throughout the inquiry and from those witnesses and staff who ably assisted it in reaching the conclusions contained in its report.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 53 and 58 of the Third Session and Issues Nos. 8 and 9 of the current Session*), is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 37 to the Journals*).

Mr. Blair, from the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Since March 27, 1972, your Committee has been seized of the following order of reference:

That the question of radio and television broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and its committees, including the legal, procedural and technical aspects thereof, and the evidence collected by the committee during the past session in relation to these matters, be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

2. The question of broadcasting the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees was referred to the Committee on March 23, 1970 in the Second Session and on October 28, 1970 in the Third Session of the 28th Parliament. Since receiving the original order of reference, the Committee has heard a number of witnesses and made two visits to the United States. From December 13 to 15, 1970 the Committee was in New York to study the broadcasting operations at the United Nations headquarters and on May 13, 1971 the Committee travelled to Washington to witness a televised sitting of the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee. A tour which was to have taken place in February 1972 and which would have given the Committee the opportunity to study the broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings in a number of European Capitals was unavoidably cancelled.

3. Your Committee heard the following witnesses:

From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Mr. George Davidson, President; Mr. J. P. Gilmore, Vice-President, Planning; Mr. Marcel Ouimet, Vice-President, Programming; Mr. Jacques Alleyn, General Counsel.

From Bushnell Communications Limited: Mr. E. Bushnell, Chairman of the Board; Mr. S. W. Griffiths, President and Managing Director; Mr. Roy Faibish, Executive Vice-President; Mr. A. G. Day, Vice-President, Engineering.

From CTV Television Network Ltd.: Mr. J. M. Packham, Vice-President, Finance; Mr. Don MacPherson, Director of News, Features and Information Programming; Mr. Bruce Phillips, Bureau Chief, CTV News, Ottawa.

From the House of Commons at Westminster: Sir Barnett Cocks, K.C.B., O.B.E., Clerk of the House of Commons.

From the Parliamentary Press Gallery: Mr. Pierre O'Neill, President; Mr. Fraser MacDougall, Past President, Mr. Dave Davidson, Secretary and Mr. Paul D. Akehurst.

From the United Nations Secretariat: Mr. Josef C. Nichols, Chief, International and Satellite Communications Unit, Radio and Visual Services Division and Mr. Ray Jask, Supervisor, United Nations Television Contractual Staff.

Mr. J. P. J. Maingot, Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel submitted a legal opinion and also made several appearances before your Committee.

Mr. Robert McCleave, a member of the Committee, also made a report to the Committee about the use of television in the Legislature of Nova Scotia.

The following made written submissions: *Canadian Contemporary News System:* Mr. Paul D. Akehurst, General Manager.

Filmakers Canada: Mr. David Battle, D.G.C., Production Director.

THE DECISION IN PRINCIPLE

4. The decision to be taken in principle is straightforward enough: should parliamentary proceedings be broadcast or not?

5. To arrive at the decision in principle the following questions must be decided:

- (a) Should the proceedings of the House be broadcast
 - (i) by radio
 - (ii) by television
 - (iii) by both radio and television?

(b) Should the proceedings of the committees of the House be broadcast

- (i) by radio
- (ii) by television
- (iii) by both radio and television?

(It is necessary to pose separate questions regarding the proceedings of the House and the proceedings of committees because it may well be decided to broadcast the one and not the other).

6. If the answers to the above two questions are in the affirmative the following subordinate questions then arise:

(a) Should the broadcasting of the proceedings of the House, whether by radio or television, be partial or total?

(b) Should the broadcasting of the proceedings of the committees of the House, whether by radio or television, be partial or total?

(c) Assuming that the full-time coverage of all committees of the House would be neither feasible nor desirable, what machinery should be established for deciding which particular committees or meetings of committees should be broadcast?

7. If the answers to the questions posed in paragraph 5 are all in the negative, the House might wish to consider whether its proceedings and those of its committees might be broadcast on ceremonial and formal occasions.

8. More detailed questions which would arise from an affirmative decision in principle, such as the type of cameras and equipment to be used, control of the broadcasts, and the need for special legislation are dealt with in later sections of this report.

THE PROS AND CONS

9. In the view of your Committee the arguments in favour of broadcasting parliamentary proceedings are strong. Radio and television, and particularly the latter, have become the most important media of mass communication and can exert a powerful influence on public opinion. If Parliament excludes itself from access to the broadcasting media it may well deny itself the opportunity of making its most effective public impact.

10. Parliament represents the people: its business is the nation's business; and one of its prime responsibilities is to inform the people. The people therefore have a right to see their Parliament in action and through television coverage this right could become a reality for all the people from coast to coast. Through television the public gallery of the House of Commons could be extended to the farthest limits of the nation. The bond between Parliament and the electorate would be strengthened because the House of Commons would be brought into the homes of all who wished to tune in to its proceedings. We are sometimes warned that we are living at a time when all the apparatus of mass suggestion works against democratic education and the unencumbered operation of the democratic process. The televising of Parliament would establish a counterweight and, in the words of the late Aneurin Bevan, encourage "intelligent communication between the House of Commons and the electorate as a whole."

11. At a time when many critics assert that Parliament is archaic, anachronistic, remote from the people or out of touch with reality, an affirmative decision in principle with regard to broadcasting might constitute a very effective rebuttal of such suggestions. While Parliament fails to keep pace with the natural evolutionary processes of mass communication, the critics will always be able to employ a powerful argument to bolster their allegations. At the present time a great deal of important political dialogue takes place before the television cameras which tends to overshadow the debates in Parliament itself. If the public could see Parliament on television greater attention might be paid to what is said in Parliament rather than outside it. A more balanced and representative presentation of public affairs would be available to viewers. To paraphrase the words of one commentator on this aspect of the matter, the entry of television into Parliament would ensure that this potent magnifier of reputations is not monopolized by interviewers, commentators, academics, and selected politicians whose opportunities depend upon the decision of program editors who are responsible to no electorate. Thus it can be contended that parliamentary democracy would be better served through the curbing of the disproportionate power of those who control broadcasting and that Parliament would be more accurately and more objectively portrayed.

12. Your Committee is also impressed with the argument that the televising of the proceedings of the House would improve Parliament's communication with the

people and would thus assist in promoting Canada's sense of national identity. A televised parliamentary record could give an exciting vitality to the history and national heritage of the country. An audio-visual record of the proceedings of the House would be a permanent and authentic record of Parliament. Great parliamentary occasions would be recorded for posterity, and it would be an historical treasure of incalculable value. If the memorable debates of the past were available today in audio-visual form, if the great parliamentarians of former days could actually be seen and heard in action, the enthralling possibilities which would be opened up for research scholars, teachers, students and the public as a whole can easily be imagined.

13. It is also to be hoped that increased public exposure would enable Parliament to extend its influence and prestige. This would be particularly salutary at a time when the complaint is so frequently heard that the powers of government are becoming increasingly concentrated in the hands of the executive. Given the opportunity of seeing Parliament in action the viewing public would more readily be able to appreciate the nature of parliamentary authority and the fact that the executive governs with the consent of Parliament. If it is accepted that Parliament's most crucial functions in this modern age are to inform, to criticize and to draw public attention to important national issues, then exposure on television should greatly assist Parliament in fulfilling these duties.

14. The arguments which are heard against the broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings largely relate to such questions as expense, technical difficulties, the working conditions of Members and the problem of editing.

15. Cost is a major factor only in relation to the televising of Parliament since sound broadcasting would not appear to involve a great deal of expense. It is true that the cost of a permanent installation is to some extent an unknown factor, particularly since it is not known what structural alterations would be required to the existing Parliament buildings. Some critics suggest that there would not be enough interest in the daily proceedings of Parliament to justify the costs which would be involved in televising them. It is doubtful, however, that these costs would be prohibitive in relation to public expenditure in general.

16. The cost to the public purse would be minimal if the House were to admit the broadcasters on condition that they finance the operation themselves. From the evidence received it would appear that some broadcasters would be prepared to finance the operation provided they were permitted to recover their costs through charges to other users of the material. If such a solution were adopted the House would presumably be required to pay only for the tapes which it decided to purchase for record purposes.

17. Because of the nature of the Parliament buildings it would be wise to anticipate technical problems if a decision were taken to proceed with a permanent tele-

vision installation. However, whatever form these problems might take your Committee has heard no evidence to suggest that they are likely to be insurmountable. The principal technical difficulty might well prove to be the effect which television would have upon the working conditions of Members.

18. Some critics insist that the disruption which would be caused by a permanent invasion of broadcasters and their equipment into the Chamber would be intolerable. They fear that the working conditions of Members would be seriously impaired; that the intensity of the lighting required would produce dazzling and overheated conditions; that the comings and goings of technical personnel would be distracting; that there would be cables to trip over, equipment to bump into, noise to contend with.

19. Your Committee accepts the validity of these anxieties but believes that the problems can be overcome. There is evidence to indicate that it is possible to operate the apparatus which would be required without any exaggerated disruption of the proceedings. Miniature remote-controlled cameras are available; controllers, operators and commentators can work in concealed conditions; and although bright lighting would be required, techniques exist which can limit the discomfort caused by heat intensity.

20. Some critics express reservations with regard to how broadcasting would affect Parliament's image and how objective and unbiased editing by the broadcasters could be guaranteed. It is contended that the nature of parliamentary debate would be radically changed by television; that Members would jockey for position in prime viewing time; that they would play to the gallery and adopt a more flamboyant style of debate. Parliament would become more of a theatre and less of a workshop as Members would be mainly concerned with making a good visual impression. Members might be encouraged to make interventions merely to "get on camera" or to spoil the effect of a good speech by an opponent. An increased tendency to deliver set speeches and employ headline-winning catchphrases would develop.

21. These anxieties seem to ignore the fact that a television audience is not concentrated in a public place. The medium is more likely to encourage rather than discourage the intimate informal style which is the essence of parliamentary debate. It is probable too that television would encourage higher rather than lower standards of behaviour and debate since Members would wish to make a good impression on screen. A Member adopting exhibitionist or ungentlemanly tactics would soon fall into disfavour. The fact of being televised might discourage the raising of spurious points of order and privilege since these would frequently not be understood by the viewing public who would probably find them boring and futile.

22. Some of the arguments used against television are reminiscent of those employed two centuries ago when Members of the British House of Commons objected to the admission of the press to their debates. There is,

therefore, good reason to believe that many of the fears expressed are exaggerated. Your Committee feels nevertheless that the importance of ensuring fair editing practices should not be underestimated.

23. The surest guarantee against bias in selection and editing would be to provide continuous live transmission, but this would presumably require a special channel. Furthermore, it is probable that there would not be widespread public interest in much of the proceedings of the House and the highlights of parliamentary business if broadcast live would not necessarily occur during prime viewing hours. While your Committee sees great value in the maintenance of a complete audio-visual record, the transmissions themselves would attract a greater viewing public if they were edited and broadcast by the broadcasting agencies during prime viewing hours.

24. The four major advantages of edited reports rather than continuous live transmissions have been summed up as follows:

- (a) they would not require a special channel;
- (b) question time and important debates and speeches taking place during the day could be seen in the evening by a large audience;
- (c) there would be no jockeying for position at peak viewing hours since an edited report could provide more even coverage;
- (d) the tedium of debate could be eliminated and points of order and privilege could be edited out unless they were likely to attract public interest.

25. It would be essential in the view of your Committee that the House keep overall surveillance and control of the broadcasts in its own hands. However, whatever system of control were adopted, the House, if it accepted the principle of edited transmissions, would be obliged to place great reliance on the integrity and fair-mindedness of the broadcasters. Your Committee has every confidence that the broadcasters would discharge their responsibility with propriety and that the question of editing would prove to be much less of a problem than some critics anticipate.

THE BROADCASTING OF PARLIAMENT IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS

26. A symposium organized by the Interparliamentary Union in Geneva in December 1968 revealed that of 50 national Parliaments surveyed 29 transmit live or recorded broadcasts of actual debates by radio and 21 transmit such broadcasts by television.¹ Complete coverage is however, rare. In the Commonwealth the broadcasting of Parliament by radio was pioneered in New Zealand where the proceedings of the House of Representatives have been broadcast by continuous live radio transmissions since 1936. Australia followed suit in 1946. The Parliaments of Austria, West Germany,

¹ See Wilson (Charles), *Parliament, peoples and mass media*, Cassell Ltd., 1970, p. 119.

Denmark, and Norway appear to be in the vanguard among Western countries as far as television broadcasting is concerned.

27. In the United Kingdom the question has been under study for some years. On June 15, 1966, the House of Lords approved by a vote of 56 to 31 a resolution calling for the televising of its proceedings on an experimental basis and in February, 1968, a closed circuit experiment took place. By curious contrast the House of Commons declined to follow the example of the Lords, when on November 24, 1966, it rejected a proposal that its proceedings be televised for an experimental period by 131 votes to 130. Your Committee understands, however, that the matter is again under active study in the British Parliament.

28. Here in Canada the Legislature of Saskatchewan has been broadcasting certain of its proceedings by radio since 1946. The Nova Scotia House of Assembly instituted a three-week television experiment in March-April 1971. The Legislative Assembly of Alberta admitted the television cameras in 1972 for the first time. In 1970 the C.B.C. conducted an experiment in the Legislature of Manitoba during which the question period was covered. Elsewhere in Canada the televising of the opening ceremonies of the Legislature has taken place on various occasions, and some jurisdictions, notably Ontario and British Columbia, have permitted the broadcasting of the budget statement.

29. The following details of the broadcasting operation in certain jurisdictions may be of interest to the House. It should be noted that the only operations of which your Committee has had direct experience are those of the United Nations, the United States Congress and, through Mr. Robert McCleave, the Nova Scotia House of Assembly. The information relating to other jurisdictions is drawn from studies and inquiries undertaken on the instructions of the Committee. It is noteworthy that, while television is widely regarded as a North American phenomenon, most of the Parliaments with practical experience of legislative broadcasting are to be found on the Continent of Europe.

The United Nations

30. The United Nations, it can be said, grew up with television. When the United Nations Building in New York was being designed, television was in its infancy and architectural changes were made to permit the installation of special lighting and hidden camera positions in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. Broadcasting is a large operation at the United Nations, and it is now the policy to televise all open meetings. To do this, a table of priorities has been established for broadcasting by television, as follows:

- (a) the Security Council,
- (b) the General Assembly, and
- (c) the committees in order of their importance.

The United Nations broadcasting staff and the networks consult in advance to determine the order of priority of

televising committees. The General Assembly, the Security Council and the senior committee rooms are equipped with lighting for colour television and storage space in the building has been converted into a control centre. There is also space for film editing and a film library. Floors are channelled to accommodate cables and outlets for the cables are installed in the committee rooms. There is also a closed-circuit system within the building so that the proceedings of meetings can be observed at several points.

31. A member of your Committee, Mr. Grant Deachman, who visited the United Nations headquarters with your Committee, prepared notes of the visit and he listed his impressions in part as follows:

At periods of highest public interest the UN boasts that its proceedings have been carried on the three US networks and radio as well as to 23 countries by satellite at a single time.

The relationship between the networks and the UN appears to be very good. The management of the UN TV facility is conscious of the need to provide interesting TV to the networks if it is to be accepted. At the same time they are equally aware of their duty to preserve the dignity and integrity of the institution in the eyes of the world. The maintaining of this balance is not an easy task and it is obvious that the senior staff members responsible for TV are not just technicians or broadcasters, but are able servants of the UN working in an area of great international sensitivity.

The UN at first invited the major networks to televise its proceedings. They soon found that the journalistic policies of the networks were not acceptable to delegates. For instance, if a delegate just arrived from a long overseas flight fell asleep on the floor of the Assembly during a debate which concerned his nation, the networks considered him fair game for their cameras. They would also give too much emphasis in the opinion of the UN, to gallery disturbances and sensational incidents. To preserve the dignity of the institution and to protect delegates from embarrassment, the UN took over the televising of meetings. It now operates the cameras in the General Assembly, the Security Council and the committees. It provides a live feed to subscribing networks while the Assembly and Council are in session as well as video tapes. The networks are supplied with booths which oversee the General Assembly and which are used largely for televising interviews with delegates or for supplementing the UN feed. In addition the networks have the freedom of the building for corridor interviews.

The UN is very strict about the use of cameras on the floor of the Assembly. It is never permitted, even for the visits of impressive heads of state. However, cameras are allowed on the floor 20 minutes before the session is to commence, at which time they can pick up colourful impressions from the delegates as they enter to take their places. At the first stroke of the gavel the floor is cleared of journalists and cameramen. At the second stroke the meeting is called to order.

The operating of TV has strained the UN budget. To defray costs the UN charges the networks for some services. Each of the three major US networks pays a connecting charge of \$800 a month for the UN feed. For video tapes they each pay a basic weekly charge of \$1200 and a \$600 surcharge for colour. They pay time-and-a-half on Sunday and after 7:00 o'clock.

The UN supplies radio live and recorded. Some radio stations carry the UN live all day. Recordings are exported to member countries around the world.

32. The United Nations broadcasting staff also prepares programs on request for television and radio stations all over the world. Such work is undertaken because, apart from the real need for such a service, the United Nations feels it has an obligation to see that its proceedings are widely publicized. Such programs include special reports on the speeches and activities of particular state delegates for broadcasting over national networks.

United States Congress

33. The proceedings of public meetings of United States Congressional committees can be broadcast by radio or television, and can be filmed or photographed; however, no cameras or any recording equipment are allowed in the United States Senate or House of Representatives except when they sit jointly on ceremonial occasions. Broadcasting of all Congressional committees takes place on a demand basis usually through a request to the Committee Chairman and the broadcasters must supply their own equipment and personnel. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970² provides in Section 116 that when any hearing of a Senate committee is open to the public, that hearing may be broadcast under such rules as the committee may adopt. Thus, each Senate committee has the authority to lay down the rules by which it can be broadcast. In the House of Representatives, Rule XI is quite explicit that such coverage is a privilege and will only be permitted and allowed in accordance with the provisions and requirements of the rule. Rule XI lays down specific guidelines as to how personnel providing coverage by radio and television and by still photography shall conduct themselves. The number of cameras, the number of still photographers, and the lighting are also provided for and where necessary it requires broadcasters to form a pool operation.

34. While in Washington, your Committee was able to attend a sitting of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee at which the Secretary of State, Mr. Rogers, was a witness. We could not help noting that the large number of television cameramen, radio broadcasters, news reporters and still photographers was very distracting and that it required a large amount of concentration by the members of the Committee in order to follow the proceedings.

New Zealand

35. The General Assembly of New Zealand was the first Parliament in the Commonwealth to broadcast its

proceedings. Sound broadcasting of the proceedings of the House of Representatives was commenced on March 24, 1936. The proceedings of the Upper Chamber, the Legislative Council, were never broadcast, and since this Chamber was abolished in 1950 this aspect of the matter is of no concern to a consideration of the current situation.

36. The decision to broadcast the proceedings of the House of Representatives was a purely administrative one. It was not taken by the House itself but by the Cabinet of the day, and arose from an election promise which had been made during an election campaign of the previous year. Giving evidence before a British Select Committee on June 17, 1965, the Speaker of the New Zealand House of Representatives said:

It was done as an executive act rather than a parliamentary act and I would have some difficulty in finding any specific authority for it.³

37. From 1936 to 1961 the ultimate control of parliamentary broadcasting was in the hands of the Prime Minister and in the early years, when the broadcasts were limited to selected debates, it was he who determined the time at which broadcasting should take place. It was not long, however, before the continuous broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings was instituted and in 1962 the Broadcasting Corporation was established to take over and operate the service. Ministers no longer have any responsibility for matters of day to day administration, but the Corporation is required to comply with the general policy of the Government with respect to broadcasting and with any general or special direction given in writing by the Minister pursuant to the policy of the Government.

38. It was also in 1962 that the broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings was first regulated by Standing Order 46 in the following terms:

Proceedings of Parliament shall be broadcast during all hours of sitting prescribed by the Standing Orders and during such other periods as may be determined by the Leader of the House.⁴

The Prime Minister as Leader of the House still has it in his power to extend the broadcasting facilities when the House sits beyond the hour of 10.30 p.m. but as a matter of courtesy he normally consults the Leader of the Opposition.

39. Legislation to regulate the broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings has never been introduced in New Zealand.

³ First Report from the Select Committee on Broadcasting, etc. of Proceedings in the House of Commons, HC 146, 8 August, 1966 Minutes of Evidence.

⁴ New Zealand, Standing Orders of the House of Representatives relating to public business, reprinted and renumbered June 1963.

² U.S.A. Public Law 91-510, 1970.

Australia

40. In contrast with the experience in New Zealand, the introduction of parliamentary broadcasting by radio was carefully planned in Australia. As a first step the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Broadcasting was requested by the Postmaster General to consider whether the broadcasting of parliamentary debates was desirable and if so to what extent and in what manner such broadcasts should be undertaken. The resultant report presented to Parliament on September 26, 1945, which was described as "a complete statement of the problems involved in such a venture", recommended "that the innovation should be introduced in this country as soon as circumstances permit."⁵

41. Parliamentary broadcasting is governed by the Parliamentary Proceedings Broadcasting Act of 1946. It provides for a Joint Committee on the Broadcasting of Parliamentary Proceedings consisting of three Senators including the President of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives including the Speaker. This Committee exercises control over the broadcasts in accordance with certain principles agreed to by Parliament. These principles deal with the daily period during which the proceedings should be broadcast, the allocation of broadcasting time between the two Houses, the rebroadcasting of proceedings, and the extent to which comments from the control booth are allowed. The Joint Committee exercises extensive powers within the framework of these principles and one of its duties is to ensure equal coverage for Government and Opposition Parties.

42. The Australian Senate, by resolution in 1971, approved in principle the televising of the proceedings of its standing and select committees at the discretion of the committees themselves but subject to such rules as the Senate would adopt as guidelines for such coverage. According to the best information available to your Committee, no rules or guidelines have as yet been adopted. However, it is our understanding that this matter is before the Senate's Committee on Privileges and has been in committee for some time.

Austria

43. Parliamentary proceedings are regularly broadcast by television and radio from the floor of the Chamber. Committee deliberations are always closed to the public and taping for radio is never allowed. Occasionally, when special permission is granted by the President of Parliament, Committee proceedings may be filmed without sound to serve as a background for the television commentators. For the past four years two cameras have continuously recorded all the proceedings in the Chamber and the official broadcasting agency has sole authority to select excerpts for television and radio news broadcasts. All films are retained in archives for the exclusive use of the television broadcasting corporation. When

Parliament is in session selections are regularly broadcast in the evening news by both television and radio.

West Germany

44. In 1966 the Bundestag entered into an agreement with West Germany's two television networks whereby certain debates are televised at the request of the media. A procedure has been established whereby the television station puts in a request to the Press Department of the Bundestag, which is under the jurisdiction of the President of the Bundestag, to be allowed to televise certain proceedings. Permission is granted by the Press Department following consultation with party representatives. Once permission has been granted, and it normally is granted, the actual televising and editing becomes the responsibility of the television station which has to conform to certain conditions with regard to the placing of cameras.

45. Television has so far been restricted to plenary sessions of the Bundestag and committee proceedings have not as yet been televised. Permission to televise is only sought when it is anticipated that the debate will arouse great public interest. Requests are made at fairly short notice, normally by telephone, but a certain amount of advance notice is necessary to provide time for consultation with party representatives.

46. In 1970 the proceedings of the Bundestag were televised on 26 days amounting to 126 hours all told divided between the two television stations. According to the information obtained by your Committee the broadcasts attracted a viewing public of some 75% of the viewing population, an unusually high proportion which is in marked contrast with the experience in other jurisdictions. The explanation probably lies in the skilful judgment exercised by the news media in selecting those parliamentary events which promise to attract a high measure of public interest.

Denmark

47. Continuous coverage of parliamentary proceedings is available in Denmark by radio and television but the use which is made of the material is selective and based upon estimated public interest. Special events are sometimes broadcast live from the Chamber, but most broadcasts are re-transmitted and include the weekly question period and the important parts of major debates. Except for special events which are broadcast live the material is usually shortened for use in evening news programs. Committee proceedings are always held in camera and are never broadcast.

48. It seems that the broadcasting methods used call for no special technical arrangements and foreign as well as domestic broadcasters are free to apply for permission to broadcast. Permission is normally granted on the understanding that it will be purely a recording operation entailing no added lights or noise. The broadcasts do not appear to attract an unusual degree of public interest unless a debate is of exceptional importance.

⁵ Eighth Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Parliamentary Paper No. 31 of 1945-46.

Norway

49. Parliamentary debates are broadcast by both television and radio in the Chamber but not in Committees. Broadcasts are selective and fairly frequent and are sometimes relayed to the public in the form of extracts. The King's speech from the Throne at the opening of a session and his dissolution speech are always broadcast live, and among the debates which are regularly broadcast, either live or in the form of extracts, are those on the Speech from the Throne, on the budget and on foreign affairs.

Sweden

50. Parliamentary proceedings are broadcast by both television and radio from the Chamber only. They are selective and variable, and the choice of material rests with the Swedish Broadcasting authorities on the basis of a formula designed to present an objective balance of views. Committee meetings are held in camera and are therefore not broadcast.

Finland

51. Parliamentary proceedings are broadcast by both television and radio from the Chamber and the broadcasts are sometimes live. Committee proceedings are not broadcast. Broadcasting is both selective and infrequent, and the choice as to what will be broadcast is made after a session begins, the concentration being at the beginning and the end of the session. Broadcasting policy is governed by regulations to ensure a proper political balance and the editor in charge of the broadcasts is responsible for adherence to these regulations.

Holland

52. Parliamentary proceedings are broadcast by both television and radio in both Chambers and in Committees. Live broadcasts occur on occasions of major interest but the more normal practice is for recorded material to be utilized during evening newscasts. The selection of items for inclusion is at the discretion of the broadcasting editor. Television broadcasts are selective and occur only infrequently, but it seems that radio coverage occurs more frequently, recorded extracts being used every evening after 10:30 p.m. while Parliament is in session. The broadcasting of committees is very infrequent because the subjects dealt with are usually fairly technical and do not attract great public interest. Furthermore, some committee meetings are held in camera.

53. The radio and television authorities in Holland have standing permission granted by Parliament to cover the debates of both Chambers. In practice the proceedings of the First Chamber (Upper House) are seldom broadcast. It appears that public interest in parliamentary broadcasting is limited and the decision as to what will be broadcast depends on what issues the broadcasting authorities feel will generate sufficient public interest.

Saskatchewan

54. Radio broadcasting of selected proceedings of the Saskatchewan Legislature was introduced in 1946 and has continued ever since. The broadcasts cover the two major debates of the Assembly, the debate on the Address and

the budget debate, which continue for a maximum of seven and eight days respectively. The selection of speeches to be broadcast is made by a Standing Committee under the chairmanship of the Speaker and the allocation of radio time is apportioned on the basis of party standings in the House, the Whips being responsible for the allocation of time to individual Members. The broadcasts begin fifteen minutes after the commencement of the sitting and last for one and one quarter hours from 2:45 p.m. until 4:00 p.m. The debates are broadcast live by some stations and rebroadcast by others. In neither case is there any editing. News commentators have not attempted to play back extracts from tapes, but it seems there is no record of this having been expressly forbidden. No records of the broadcasts are kept except those taped records, prepared independently of the broadcasts, from which the Official Report is prepared.

Nova Scotia

55. From March 22 to April 8, 1971, the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia conducted a three-week television experiment during which the entire proceedings were recorded and the broadcasters did the editing. Both the C.B.C. and the C.T.V. were involved in the experiment and it appears that the editing was fair and the public reaction favourable.

56. Two large Marconi cameras were installed in the galleries, one on either side of the Speaker's Chair. As a result the camera angles were not ideal. A member of your Committee, Mr. R. J. McCleave, observed the experiment during one week and recorded his impressions in a brief report, from which the following paragraphs are extracted:

The CBC installed two large cameras, Marconi, in the galleries on either side of the Legislature. The Nova Scotia house meets in a small room, and the seats run in a half-oval on three sides. Camera angles were generally acute, and sometimes unflattering to the bald or balding. It might also be noted that in any event too many MLA's were seen with their faces lowered, and this was disconcerting—a situation due to the acute camera angles. Mr. Speaker George Mitchell was always seen in profile, since there was no camera directly in front of him.

Early in the experiment, the usually well-lit room was brightened by extra lights. These were removed after complaints by Mr. Speaker and members. There was no appreciable loss of telecast quality, although purists familiar with focussing would notice delays in shifting from an opposition questioner to a replying Minister, and the hand of a member seated back of the member on camera might appear double life-size.

The output of the two cameras was fed into a large van situated outside the Legislature.

As for sound, this was obtained off the microphone recording system in the Legislature... The only reservation about the sound system is that the pounding on the desks comes across like an outbreak of cannon-ading, and distressed many viewers.

57. It appears that no further steps are contemplated in Nova Scotia for the time being. After the experiment the media proposed that the Government should defray the expenses of any further television coverage and the Government declined to do so. A complete radio tape is now made which the media are permitted to edit.

Alberta

58. On March 15, 1972 the Legislative Assembly of Alberta decided to admit the television cameras to their Friday sittings. Both the C.B.C. and C.T.V. were approached and it was the latter which agreed to the proposal. The coverage which takes place consists mainly of the question period and is rebroadcast on the following Sunday. From the evidence available to your Committee it appears that the editing has been fair, and while no specific guidelines have been laid down no problems have so far arisen.

59. Two cameras are used which are situated on the floor of the Chamber to the right and left of the Speaker. The question period is regulated in such a way that the Speaker notes the Members who wish to ask a question and gives the nod to each Member when his turn arises. The camera does not therefore present the viewer with the spectacle of Members continually standing up and sitting down.

60. The televising of the proceedings has been provided for in the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly. There is no radio coverage but the media would be permitted to plug into the Assembly's own sound system. It is also interesting to note that tape recorders are permitted in the press gallery. Press cameras are also permitted provided no flash is used and the Speaker's permission is obtained.

THE TECHNICAL ASPECT

61. From a technical point of view it is clear that the broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings by radio and television is a feasible proposition. If the House were to take an affirmative decision in principle, radio broadcasting could be introduced almost at once. The adoption of the present sound and simultaneous interpretation systems used in the House and in committee rooms to permit of radio broadcasting would pose no technical difficulties. But while radio could easily be introduced it should be borne in mind that the questions of law, editing and control which would arise if the proceedings were televised would be similar in the case of radio.

62. Television broadcasting raises more weighty technical questions and several options would be open to the House with regard to the *modus operandi*. Some of the methods which would be available for conducting a television operation are briefly summarized below:

Complete audio-visual record of proceedings or electronic Hansard

63. This option envisages the maintenance of a continuous and permanent audio-visual record of the complete proceedings of the House and of selected committees.

It would be produced by staff employed by the House with equipment owned by the House and it would be fed to a central control to provide the broadcasters with a direct audio-visual feed from the Chamber and from the committee rooms where broadcasting was taking place. The broadcasters would be free to make such use of the material as they thought appropriate subject to the conditions and guidelines laid down by the House. They could feed it live to the networks or keep it for subsequent rebroadcasting. They could edit and select from it for news, documentary and other public affairs programming. It would be in effect an electronic Hansard which the broadcasters could use in much the same way as the press uses the printed Hansard and other Parliamentary publications.

64. This option contemplates a permanent installation of television broadcasting equipment to record the proceedings in the Chamber. Portable equipment could be used in committee rooms if, as your Committee assumes, the televising of committee proceedings were to be selective. Perhaps in the case of certain committees a complete audio-visual record would be desirable. A method of selecting the committees to be broadcast would need to be devised probably through consultation with the representatives of the broadcasting media.

Pool Operation on demand of Broadcasters

65. This would in effect be a joint operation by broadcasters who would employ their own staff and equipment to cover the proceedings of the House and committees. Under this system, the broadcasters would request permission through a pre-determined procedure to cover a particular debate or series of debates in the House or meeting or series of meetings of committees, and would then proceed to install and operate their equipment when permission was granted. The House would control the operation by laying down its own conditions and guidelines and broadcasting would take place only on the basis of the demand by the broadcasters.

Private Contractor or Licensed Operator

66. A variation of the "pool operation", this alternative envisages that the House would enter into a contract with a private broadcaster or contractor to cover the proceedings of the House and its committees. The selection of the proceedings to be broadcast would presumably be decided at the request of the broadcasters and the coverage would take place under such conditions and guidelines as the House would specify. The advantage of this option lies in the greater control it would give to the House over production operations.

Cablevision Operation

67. Envisaged by this option is a continuous live transmission of all proceedings of the House over a cablevision system. It would also allow for the simultaneous recording and storage of the proceedings for rebroadcasting purposes. From the evidence submitted to your Committee, it would appear that it would not be possible for this system to be introduced immediately

on a coast to coast basis and it should be noted that this method would allow for either a "demand-pool operation" or a "contractor or licensed operator" operation. As with the electronic Hansard, it also envisages the permanent installation of facilities in the House itself.

Other Technical Considerations

68. With all of the above options, various technical considerations are involved, and your Committee feels that these are aspects on which it requires a great deal more information before it can make a final recommendation. Your Committee thinks that it is better to confine itself at this stage to stating in general terms the various technical problems which have been raised. It is felt that the House should have the benefit of detailed expert knowledge which would arise out of a cost and technical study of the kind which is discussed later in this Report.

69. Your Committee is convinced that no Member would want to see the Chamber of the House interfered with or changed in any radical way by the introduction of television. Therefore, very serious questions arise as to the type of camera that should be used in the House. For example, should they be remote controlled or live operated cameras? Evidence before your Committee suggested that remote controlled cameras could be discreetly hung from the balconies surrounding the House. But questions were raised as to the technical quality of such cameras for broadcasting purposes. Manually operated cameras would have to be positioned in the galleries and would in the opinion of some witnesses and Members intrude seriously on the Chamber. The type of camera and the positioning of the apparatus are factors which your Committee feels require very serious study.

70. If it is decided to televise the proceedings of the House, it will then have to be decided whether to do so in colour or in black and white. This raises important considerations with regard to lighting. Colour television demands very bright lights which result in high temperatures in the Chamber which the present air conditioning system does not appear capable of handling. The recent experience of Members during the visit of the President of the United States when he addressed both Houses was most uncomfortable and leads your Committee to conclude that such lighting without provision for adequate air conditioning would result in very uncomfortable conditions in the Chamber.

71. There are many other allied problems which need to be studied. These concern the staff and the accommodation necessary to the operation, methods of insuring that cameras are properly handled, simultaneous interpretation, the need for an informed commentator who would be able to explain the proceedings to the listening and viewing public, and the arrangements which should be made for committee meetings held outside the precincts of Parliament.

STILL PHOTOGRAPHY

72. Still photography is not mentioned in the Committee's order of reference, but it should be taken into con-

sideration, because if television cameras are admitted into the Chamber a demand for equal rights on the part of the press has to be anticipated. At present still photography is allowed in committee rooms prior to the commencement of a committee hearing. This system has much to commend it. It permits the press to take their photographs before a meeting but prevents the intrusion of photographers while a committee is conducting a hearing such as your Committee witnessed at the meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington.

73. If the House were to allow the taking of still photographs in the Chamber, it would be essential to insist on the use of cameras which do not require a flash and your Committee understands that there are such cameras available on the market. If the House were to admit press photographers consideration would have to be given to the times at which such photographs would be permitted and the vantage points from which they could be taken. It would not, for example, be possible to permit photographers to roam at will through the Chamber in search of the most favourable vantage point. It would also be desirable to ensure that any photographs taken in the Chamber would be representative of the House at work and not simply designed to draw attention to a sparse attendance such as can be expected, for example, during Private Members' Hour on a Friday afternoon.

CONTROL OF THE BROADCASTS

74. If the House agrees to the broadcasting of its proceedings your Committee believes that it should maintain overall control over the broadcasts regardless of the option which is selected. Although your Committee has every confidence that the broadcasting media would exercise responsible judgment in the selection of material, it is felt that the editing should take place under the authority of the House and in accordance with conditions and guidelines laid down by the House. A broadcast record cannot be edited in the manner of a press report; it can be edited only by selection and cutting, and if the media were free to select the material without any sanction or restraint the risk of abuse would always be present. What is at stake is the dignity of Parliament as an institution. Your Committee has no thought of presenting Members of Parliament to the public in a rosier light than they deserve. Members must accept the consequences of their words and actions just like other citizens. But they are entitled to be protected from misrepresentation and manufactured ridicule and from the kind of affront which would reflect on Parliament as an institution.

75. The question of control of editorship must be considered in conjunction with the method by which the broadcasting operation would be conducted. It seems that there are three possible methods which could be employed. In the first place the House could take over the entire operation itself which would involve purchasing its own equipment, establishing a permanent installation in the building and recruiting its own staff of directors, editors, cameramen and technicians. Continuous live transmission of the complete proceedings of the House would be broadcast over special radio and television channels. If

the House were to direct the entire operation in this way no real problems of editorship would arise unless private broadcasters were also given access to the audio-visual material to use and edit as they pleased.

76. The *modus operandi* described in the preceding paragraph would give rise to serious practical problems since it would call for special radio and television channels. Even if such channels could be made available they would be permanently occupied with the proceedings of the House of Commons and if the Senate were also to decide to broadcast its proceedings it would be necessary either to find additional special channels or to come to some arrangement whereby the two Houses shared the broadcasting time. Furthermore, if special channels were permanently occupied with the proceedings in the Chamber it might be difficult to make provision for the broadcasting of committee proceedings. Quite apart from these problems a continuous live transmission would not always bring the highlights of debate to the viewing public during prime viewing hours.

77. Your Committee therefore takes the view that if the House were to decide to direct its own operation it should limit itself to making a complete audio-visual record of the proceedings and providing the broadcasters with access to it to use as they saw fit subject to the conditions and guide-lines laid down by the House. If this option were selected the House would still employ its own staff and equipment but would not undertake the task of editorship for rebroadcasting purposes. It could, however, reserve to itself the right to oversee the editorship of the broadcasts.

78. The third option open to the House would be to decide against installing a system of its own and to leave the entire management of the broadcasting operation to the broadcasters themselves who would use their own staff and equipment. In this case the financial arrangements would have to be worked out in agreement between the House and the broadcasters. The work of editorship would be the entire responsibility of the broadcasters but it would take place in accordance with the conditions and guide-lines laid down by the House which could maintain general oversight and control.

79. The machinery of supervisory control could be fundamentally similar whether the broadcasters recorded the material themselves or were given access to an electronic Hansard recorded and owned by the House. Two methods of control suggest themselves to your Committee.

80. The first method would be to vest direct control in Mr. Speaker who would make such arrangements as in his discretion he deemed necessary to ensure effective surveillance of the use made of the material. If the House were to maintain its own electronic Hansard he would control the access to the material and would have the right to take disciplinary action against broadcasters who abused their privileges. This action would presumably take the form of denial of access to the audio-visual material. If the House were to delegate the running of

the operation to the broadcasters, Mr. Speaker would maintain a similar surveillance of their activities and would have the right to suspend a broadcaster's privileges or refuse him permission to initiate broadcasts. In short, Mr. Speaker would protect the rights of Members in any way which would seem to him to be necessary and would presumably deal with any question of privilege relating to the broadcasts in the same way as he deals now with other questions of privilege.

81. The second alternative would be to vest control in a committee of the House which could either be a committee specifically nominated for the purpose or an existing committee such as the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. As has already been mentioned above, this responsibility in Australia is discharged by a Joint Committee of both Houses and its powers and responsibilities are set out in the Parliamentary Proceedings Broadcasting Act of 1946.

82. If a committee of the House were to assume these responsibilities its terms of reference would presumably permit it to set down the general conditions and policy guide-lines under which the broadcasters would be permitted to operate, subject to the confirmation of the House. If the House owned the facilities the Committee might be given certain responsibilities in connection with the hiring of staff and the purchase of equipment. In these circumstances access to the electronic Hansard would be controlled by the committee and the use made of the audio-visual material would be required to conform to its conditions and guide-lines. If the broadcasters ran the operation themselves they would have to conform to similar conditions and guide-lines in the use they made of the material they recorded. The right to take disciplinary action where necessary could also fall within the competence of the committee, if the House deemed this to be desirable. In this case the committee would presumably be authorized to deal with any complaints by Members referred to it by Mr. Speaker. It would probably not be feasible, however, to involve the committee in the daily administration of the broadcasting operation.

83. In considering the guide-lines to be laid down for the control of broadcasting, reference might be made to section 116 of the United States Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. This section lays down extensive ground rules for the broadcasting of congressional committee hearings. The Section provides, *inter alia*, that the broadcast coverage of committee hearings should be "in conformity with acceptable standards of dignity, propriety and decorum"; that their purpose shall be "for the education, enlightenment and information of the general public"; that the tapes may not be used for any partisan political purpose; that not more than four television cameras operating from fixed positions shall be permitted in a hearing room; that the intensity of any additional lighting employed should be limited to what is strictly necessary; that flood-lights, spot-lights and similar devices shall be prohibited; that not more than five press photographers shall be permitted to cover a hearing by still photography; and that the staff and equipment em-

played shall not be permitted to cause any kind of obstruction to the proceedings of the committee. The Section empowers the committee to decide whether or not to admit the broadcasters and photographers and also prohibits commercial sponsorship.

84. A number of the witnesses who gave evidence before your Committee stressed that an expert commentator would be needed to explain points of procedure to the listening and viewing audience when parliamentary broadcasts were being transmitted. This is an important consideration which any system of control should take into account before guide-lines are finalized.

85. One witness referred in his evidence to the fact that the greater part of the proceedings of Parliament take place in the English language. The fact would certainly have to be faced that French-speaking Canadians would receive much of the broadcasts through interpretation and it would therefore be important to ensure that the interpretation was of a very superior quality.

86. The prohibition of commercial sponsorship for which Section 116 of the United States Legislative Reorganization Act 1970 provides is consistent with Parliamentary dignity and decorum. It is however a question which might have to be given special consideration if the House were to enter into arrangements with private broadcasters. Sponsorship has a direct bearing on expenses and if broadcasters were obliged to pay fees or incur costs it might be neither fair nor practical to prohibit commercial sponsorship.

ASPECTS OF LAW AND PRIVILEGE

87. Your Committee has no doubt that a Member is protected by absolute privilege in respect of anything he says in Parliament. This protection is founded in the British North America Act (section 18) and in the Senate and House of Commons Act (sections 4, 5 and 6). Whether or not a Member is equally protected by absolute privilege when a speech made in Parliament is simultaneously broadcast by sound or television is arguable. While expert witnesses giving evidence before British parliamentary committees have confidently expressed the view that Members would continue to be protected, the Parliamentary Counsel has expressed the opinion that, in the Canadian context, there is some doubt in the matter.

88. As has already been noted above, parliamentary broadcasting in Australia is governed by the Parliamentary Proceedings Broadcasting Act 1946. This Act extends protection to the broadcasters, but in the Australian view the protection enjoyed by Members themselves is founded in the Australian Constitution and the Bill of Rights of 1688. In 1945 the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Broadcasting was advised that if the whole of the proceedings were broadcast a qualified privilege would apply to the broadcasters. This qualified privilege could only be upset by proof of malice and it would be difficult to establish malice if the whole of the proceedings were broadcast. As Parliament had provided for the absolute protection of Hansard reports it was thought prudent to

introduce legislation to provide the protection of absolute privilege to broadcasts of the proceedings.

89. Section 15 of the Australian Parliamentary Proceedings Broadcasting Act 1946, therefore, provides:

No action or proceeding, civil or criminal, shall lie against any person for broadcasting or rebroadcasting any portion of the proceedings of Parliament.

90. The wording of this section would appear to confer upon all broadcasters the same protection of absolute privilege which is enjoyed by a Member when speaking in Parliament. It is understood from information supplied to your Committee, however, that in practice the protection applies only to persons authorized to broadcast or rebroadcast. Your Committee understands that no problems have arisen which were not fully provided for under the legislation.

91. In contrast with Australia, legislation to regulate the broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings has never been introduced in New Zealand. The view taken in New Zealand was that a member was fully protected by absolute privilege in respect of any words spoken by him in Parliament whether they were broadcast or not and that no further statutory protection was necessary. The New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation takes the view that the broadcasts constitute an extension from the public galleries of the House of Representatives and that since they are continuous throughout normal sitting hours they therefore constitute a fair and accurate report of the proceedings. It should be noted however that the broadcasting company is Crown owned and not liable for its tortious acts.

92. In 1949 the Legislative Assembly Act of Saskatchewan was amended by the extension of the provision relating to immunities and privileges of Members. Section 34 of the Act now reads as follows:

34(1) No member of the Assembly shall be liable to any civil action or prosecution, arrest, imprisonment or damages by reason of any matter or thing brought by him by petition, bill, resolution, motion or otherwise or by reason of anything said by him before the Assembly.

(2) The immunity provided by subsection (1) applies notwithstanding that words spoken by a member before the Assembly are broadcast, provided that the broadcasting takes place while the words are being so spoken.⁶

93. The Act thus protects the absolute privilege of Members but makes no provision for the protection of those who broadcast the proceedings. It is probably assumed that the qualified privilege which protects those who report the debates in the press extends also to the broadcasters. The lack of specific protection does not appear to have caused any problems during the 25 years that parliamentary broadcasting has been taking place.

⁶ The Legislative Assembly Act—Chapter 3—Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan 1955.

94. In considering the protection afforded to Members, broadcasters and interpreters under the present law your Committee called for the views of the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel, Mr. J. P. J. Maingot, who presented a considered legal opinion. A summary of his advice to the Committee is set out in Paragraphs 95 to 102 which follow.

95. The position in England in this matter is still under study. The Select Committee of the House in England which studied the question in 1966-67⁷, reported that the privilege of freedom of speech would continue to protect any member from legal action in respect of what he said in debate in the House if the debate was broadcast and that broadcasting organizations would be able to rely on the legal defence of qualified privilege so that fair and faithful reports would be protected; partial reports where malice could be established against the organization would not be protected. The Committee concluded that if parliamentary broadcasting were permitted, it would be desirable to enact a safeguarding clause similar to the clause enacted in the Australian Act of 1946.

96. A Joint Committee was then established subsequently and it submitted an interim report December 1969⁸. It concluded first of all that there should, in principle, be no difference in the law of defamation applicable to official reports of parliamentary proceedings whether those reports be printed or broadcast. It then considered whether the existing law of defamation required any amendment so as to give effect to this principle. The Joint Committee stated that whatever the press could do under the Parliamentary Papers Act of 1840, the broadcaster could also do, but that when it came to publication of debates by radio and television, the Act offered no protection to a broadcaster. If it were decided to permit "live" broadcasts, the 1840 Act in the opinion of the Joint Committee could and should be amended by enacting that "publication" be deemed to include broadcasting so that when the debate was broadcast by television it would be a "publication" for purposes of the law of defamation and also under the authority of the House. With respect to extracts or abstracts of the proceedings, the Defamation Act 1952 amended that part of the 1840 Act relating to extracts and abstracts by including "broadcasting" when that Act referred to printing. The Joint Committee concluded that if either House of Parliament broadcast an abstract or extract of its proceedings the broadcasting company could produce the relevant sound or video recording and if they demonstrated that it was published in good faith and without malice, the company would have a good defence to any person alleging that the extract or abstract defamed him.

97. The Joint Committee said that as the law stands the broadcasting companies would enjoy qualified privilege in respect of the live broadcasting of parliamentary pro-

ceedings and are therefore in the same position as the press in reporting the proceedings. The Joint Committee concluded by recommending that the 1840 Act be amended to include "broadcasting" in the expression "publication of reports", but that the initial recording of the proceedings be done by House employees who would enjoy absolute protection. When fed to the broadcasting agencies for transmission to the public the "rebroadcast" of the proceedings or extracts or abstracts therefrom would be subject to the qualified privilege at present available to the press.

98. The Parliamentary Counsel takes the view that, basic to the study of the legal consequences of broadcasting parliamentary proceedings, is a requirement to differentiate between the official publication of parliamentary proceedings by means of broadcasting and press and broadcast reporting of the proceedings which are officially published. The reporting of official parliamentary proceedings by press or broadcaster is not based on the privileges of Parliament but is based on public policy. This principle assumes that although the publication of the official reports may be to the disadvantage of the particular individual concerned, yet it is of vast importance to the public that the proceedings of Parliament should be universally known, provided however that anyone reporting only part of the proceedings gives a fair report of what transpired. This applies to the reporting of official reports and before this legal qualified privilege attains to the reporting of part of an official publication or for that matter, before a legal absolute privilege attains to the reporting of an official publication in toto, it must be established that the publication is in law official.

99. The Canadian law of Parliament in the matter of official publication is the same as that of the British Parliament and both stem from the Parliamentary Papers Act of 1840. Sections 7, 8 and 9 of our Senate and House of Commons Act state that the "publication" by or under the authority of the Senate or House of Commons of any report, paper, votes or proceedings are absolutely privileged in toto and that anyone using extracts therefrom has a qualified privilege in the legal sense. However, "publication" in the context of the Act authorizes only printing, and a simple amendment could extend it to broadcasting. In the interim however, it is felt that if the House of Commons proceeded to broadcast without enabling legislation, a court in ruling on an alleged defamation which was broadcast, would be competent and compelled to fall back on the basic principle which lies behind parliamentary privilege: the question being, is the broadcasting of these proceedings necessary for the House to perform its function as a legislative body? The court might find that it is not necessary. This would apply equally to the whole of the proceedings being broadcast or an impartial extract of the broadcast. This is suggested because what is being affected by broadcasting is not simply an internal matter of the House of Commons but one which affects the rights of persons outside the House viz., those persons who may be defamed.

⁷ First Report from the Select Committee on Broadcasting, etc. of Proceedings in the House of Commons, HC 146, 8 August, 1966 Minutes of Evidence.

⁸ First Report of the Joint Committee on the Publication of Proceedings in Parliament, HL 26 and HC 48, 3 December, 1969.

100. With regard to the constitutional question, section 18 of the British North America Act provides that Parliament has the authority to define its privileges, immunities and powers but not so as to confer any which exceed those at that time held and enjoyed by the British Houses of Parliament. Pursuant to section 18 of the British North America Act, section 4 of the Senate and House of Commons Act was enacted and it provides that each House and its members hold and enjoy the same privileges, immunities and powers as those held by the British Houses of Parliament in 1867 and that Parliament may define them further, with the proviso as found in section 18. Section 91 of the British North America Act, however, provides that Parliament may make laws in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects assigned exclusively to the provincial legislatures. Therefore, Parliament may amend section 18 of the British North America Act to provide that its privileges may exceed those of the British Parliament.

101. The question of whether the privilege of freedom of speech enjoyed by members would extend to the occasions when speeches made in the House were published by means of broadcasting, and the concomitant effect on broadcasters, is not settled in England. It would therefore be necessary to amend section 18 of the British North America Act to remove the present restriction whereby the privileges, immunities and powers of the Canadian Parliament may not by Act of Parliament exceed those held and enjoyed by the British Parliament. The right to legislate in matters of civil rights rests with the provincial legislatures and there is a danger of the civil rights of persons being jeopardized in the event defamatory words affecting a third party are uttered and broadcast. However, section 18 of the British North America Act is an express grant to Parliament giving it authority to deal with the immunities and privileges of Parliament and its members. It transcends the effect that in so doing the civil rights of individuals may be transgressed.

102. In legislating that its proceedings may with impunity be published by means of broadcasting, Parliament would be defining its privileges as authorized by section 18 of the British North America Act. That is to say, a member's immunity and freedom to speak as he sees fit, subject only to the rules of the House, would continue while his speech was being heard and/or while he was being seen on television outside the Chamber. Parliament therefore would by statute be spelling out that each House may publish the speeches of its members by broadcasting them. The provinces on the other hand would continue to legislate on whether the reporting of a debate is in law privileged but they could not include in any definition of libel, a defamatory statement uttered during a speech which was broadcast from the Chamber because this relates to how the proceedings of each House may be published, which is well within the privileges of Parliament.

103. On the evidence and advice available to your Committee it is not therefore clear what protection would be available under existing laws to Members of Parliament, to broadcasters of parliamentary proceedings, to interpreters of such proceedings, to witnesses giving evidence before parliamentary committees, and to others involved in or affected by parliamentary broadcasting. The Parliamentary Counsel in the opinion referred to above and which is summarized in paragraphs 95 to 102, concluded that if the proceedings of the House of Commons were to be broadcast the following matters of law would need to be taken into consideration:

(a) The courts would have jurisdiction to determine the validity of any claimed privilege of the House.

(b) It is questionable whether the present law of Parliament includes in its privilege of freedom of speech the freedom on the part of a Member to libel a third party and have it published by broadcasting. The broadcasting company would not be protected in these circumstances.

(c) The courts may well find that a Member is also not protected.

(d) The present law of Parliament in England relating to the privilege of freedom of speech does not clearly establish that the publication of proceedings by broadcasting is inherent or included in this privilege.

(e) Section 18 of the British North America Act which states that the House of Commons enjoys the same privileges as those in the British House of Commons and may, by Act of Parliament, define these privileges (but not so as to exceed those held by the British House at the time of the passing of such Act), may in this regard be amended so as to define these privileges to, in fact, exceed those held by the British House of Commons.

(f) Sections 7, 8 and 9 of the Senate and House of Commons Act would be required to be amended *inter alia* to define "publication" to include broadcasting.

(g) The privilege of freedom of speech would be required to be defined to include the occasion when the Member speaks while the proceedings are being broadcast.

104. It seems, therefore, that there would be a need for Federal legislation to protect Members, broadcasters, interpreters and others. One of the decisions which would need to be taken is whether absolute privilege or qualified privilege should apply to the broadcasters. The Parliamentary Proceedings Broadcasting Act 1946 of Australia confers absolute privilege on the broadcasters. The view expressed in Great Britain by the former Lord Chancellor, Lord Gardiner, and by the Joint Committee on the Publication of Proceedings in Parliament in its first report is that the broadcasters should be on the same

footing as the press and protected by qualified privilege.⁹ The principle underlying qualified privilege is that an accurate report published in good faith and without malice or intent to injure is protected, whereas a selective or garbled report is not. If the broadcasters were able to rely upon absolute privilege as in Australia they would be protected even if they broadcast a speech or extract from a speech containing a defamatory statement in isolation from the rest of the debate. The House might consider that the best course of action would be to extend absolute privilege to any broadcasters employed by Parliament while engaged in their duties under the authority of either House, but to limit the protection accorded to all other broadcasters to that of qualified privilege.

105. As a number of legal uncertainties seem to exist the House might well consider the desirability of passing a special Act if an affirmative decision were taken with regard to the broadcasting of its proceedings. Prior to the drafting of such an Act it would appear desirable that the law officers of the Crown should study the complexities and implications of this question. On the basis of the evidence available to your Committee, however, it seems that the Act might reasonably include the following provisions:

(a) The extension of the protection of absolute privilege to Members of Parliament and Senators when speeches delivered in the Chamber or in a committee are transmitted by means of radio and television.

(b) The protection of the broadcasters of parliamentary proceedings by absolute privilege if they are employed by Parliament at times when they are discharging their duties under the authority of Parliament.

(c) The protection of other broadcasters of parliamentary proceedings by qualified privilege, thus placing them on the same footing as the press.

(d) The protection by absolute privilege of those involved in the simultaneous interpretation of parliamentary proceedings in either House or in a committee.

(e) The extension of the protection of absolute privilege to witnesses giving evidence before a parliamentary committee when their evidence is broadcast.

(f) The protection by absolute privilege of all parliamentary employees who might in any way be involved in the broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings when acting under the direct instructions of either House of Parliament or their committees.

106. In drafting such legislation regard should be taken of the statutory authority of the Canadian Radio-Television Commission in respect of all broadcasting in Canada. Your Committee is aware that broadcasters have a statutory obligation to maintain copies of all broadcasts, audio and visual, for a fixed period of time. It

occurs to your Committee that in the event of complaints by Members concerning the broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings it would be essential to establish a machinery for obtaining copies of the audio or visual tapes concerned. In view of the statutory authority of the Canadian Radio-Television Commission it would appear that this is the body with which direct communication should be maintained for the purpose of obtaining the tapes of the broadcasts complained of. Your Committee envisages a process whereby a Member would formally complain to Mr. Speaker who would request the Canadian Radio-Television Commission to obtain a certified copy of the tapes concerned which could then be examined to establish whether or not there was a *prima facie* case of privilege.

107. One further point which might be noted at this stage of your Committee's report concerns the rights of witnesses appearing before committees. The United States Legislative Reorganization Act 1970 allows all witnesses the right to request that their evidence should not be broadcast. This appears to be fair and your Committee feels that this right might commend itself to the House if broadcasting were to be introduced.

CONSULTATION WITH THE SENATE

108. Being a Committee of the House, your Committee's order of reference limits it to considering the question of broadcasting only as it affects the House. However, in the view of your Committee no far-reaching decision should be made without consultation with the other House. Both Houses share the same building, and as the introduction of broadcasting would involve staff, equipment, installation, the use of radio and television channels and possible structural alterations to the building, it would be advisable to seek the views of the other place and, if they also favoured the cost and technical study recommended below, co-ordinate future planning.

109. Some witnesses before your Committee expressed the view that the Senate should be included with the House in any coverage which might be introduced and that the operation should be owned and controlled by Parliament. It is interesting to note that in Australia the proceedings of both the Senate and the House of Representatives are continuously broadcast over a special radio channel and that control is vested in a joint committee of both Houses in terms of the Parliamentary Proceedings Broadcasting Act of 1946.

110. Having regard to the substantial capital costs which would be involved in any permanent installation, the House would be well advised to consult the Senate prior to the planning stage and to make provision for any future cooperation which might be desirable. Consultation is of particular importance if needless duplication of costs and services is to be avoided.

111. If the House decides to take an affirmative decision in principle with regard to the broadcasting of its proceedings your Committee believes that a message

⁹First Report of the Joint Committee on the Publication of Proceedings in Parliament, HL 26 and HC 48, 3 December, 1969.

should be sent to the Senate without delay, officially informing the other House of the decision and proposing joint consultation with regard to future planning.

COST AND TECHNICAL STUDY

112. It will be apparent from the preceding paragraphs that while your Committee favours parliamentary broadcasting in principle it is not ready to commit itself unreservedly without further study of the costs and technical problems involved. Your Committee believes, therefore, that a cost and technical study should be undertaken to examine the feasibility of broadcasting the proceedings of the House and its committees by radio and television having regard to the nature of the Parliament Buildings.

113. Such a study should take every aspect of parliamentary broadcasting into account, including the nature of the equipment required, the housing and wiring for that equipment, the structural alterations required to the building, the lighting and air conditioning requirements in the Chamber and in committee rooms, the staffing and staff accommodation necessary to the operation, methods of ensuring that operators and equipment are not overly obtrusive, and all other relevant questions.

114. It is most important that the study should include a costing operation. Various estimates of costs were made available to the Committee, including those for a complete and ideal system as recommended by a United Nations expert. This estimate did not, however, take into account the most unpredictable factor, namely the costs which would be involved in the structural alterations which would become necessary to the building if a permanent installation were to be introduced. Your Committee is not at this stage in possession of estimates for any kind of operation which it regards with sufficient confidence as offering a reliable guide to the House, all factors being taken into account. However, although capital costs cannot at this stage be fully assessed, it is probable that operating costs would not be excessive in relation to public expenditure in many other areas of comparable importance. Your Committee also understands that the cost factor would be of no great significance if sound broadcasting alone were to be introduced.

115. If the House were to own its own installation some costs might be recoverable through charges to the users of the material. This raises a question of policy, as the House would have to decide whether access to television and radio transmissions from the House and its committees would be offered to broadcasters on a free or cost basis. If the broadcasters were permitted to run the operation themselves the financial arrangements would presumably be negotiated between the House and the broadcasters and would raise no issues involving the proposed cost and technical study.

116. Your Committee also believes that radio and television experiments should be conducted in conjunction with the cost and technical study which would in effect be a dress rehearsal to give Members an idea

of how their conditions would be affected by the broadcasting of debates. It was made quite clear by witnesses that the admission of television to Parliament would change the working lives of Members completely. It would be as well if the House could be given some idea of just how radical the change would be before committing itself to a final decision.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

117. Your Committee, while agreeing in principle with the radio and television broadcasting of the proceedings of legislative assemblies and their committees, believes that certain further steps should be taken before a final report is made and therefore recommends:

(a) that a cost and technical study of building, equipment, personnel and other requirements consequent upon the introduction of radio and television broadcasting of the House of Commons and its committees be undertaken in consultation with this Committee;

(b) that closed-circuit experimental broadcasts by radio and television of the proceedings of the House and its committees be undertaken in consultation with this Committee; and

(c) that your Committee be authorized, in the light of the above-mentioned studies and experiments, to make further recommendations to the House for ultimate decision.

* * * *

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the 2nd Session and Issues Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 6 of the 3rd Session*) is returned and a copy of the Minutes of Proceedings (*Issue No. 4*) of the present Session is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 38 to the Journals*).

By unanimous consent, pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following six Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns.

No. 119—*Mr. Latulippe*

Are there any non-Canadians who work for the federal government in Canada and, if so, from what countries do they originate?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/119.

No. 186—*Mr. Marshall*

Have employers been reminded by the Unemployment Insurance Commission of the legal requirement (a) to provide leaving employees with separation certificates within five days (b) to produce copies of correspondence or other means of direction and, if so, by what method?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/186.

No. 329—*Mr. Hales*

1. How many public servants are still red-circled and in what departments are they employed?

2. How many years of service did each have when red-circled?

3. What effect will this have on the pension of each?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/329.

No. 377—*Mr. Robinson*

Will the government support the Canadian Youth Hostels Association's quality approach to hostelling in order to maintain standards in accordance with International Federation rules?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/377.

No. 535—*Mr. Yewchuk*

1. For each year 1967 to 1971 inclusive, what was the total amount of money received by each province (or Canada) for exporting (a) skim milk powder (b) cottage cheese (c) cheddar cheese (d) cattle (i) beef animals (ii) dairy cows (e) beef (f) butter (g) hog (h) pork?

2. For the same period, what was the amount expended by province (or Canada) for importing (a) skim milk powder (b) cottage cheese (c) cheddar cheese (d) cattle (i) beef animals (ii) dairy cows (e) beef (f) butter (g) hog (h) pork?

3. For the 5-year period, 1967 to 1971, how many head of cattle (a) beef animals (b) dairy cows did Canada exports to (i) US (ii) USSR (iii) European Economic Market (iv) Britain (v) Scandinavia (vi) other?

4. For that same period, how many head of cattle (a) beef animals (b) dairy cows did Canada import from those countries?

5. In each case, if the information is not available, for what reason?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/535.

No. 629—*Mr. Muir*

1. Of the 85 students hired under competition number 71-IAN-HAL-0-1020 by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, what were the names, addresses and university attended by each one?

2. In each instance, was the student hired as a unilingual English guide or a bilingual guide and in each instance, was there a recommendation written or otherwise from a Member of Parliament and, if so, in each instance, what was the name of the Member of Parliament?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/629.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Mr. Rose, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-228, An Act to amend the Pension Benefits Standard Act (information to employees), which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Rose, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-229, An Act to amend the Copyright Act, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, was again considered at the report stage.

Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, moved,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended by deleting lines 33 to 39 on page 3 thereof and by substituting therefor:

“(ii) entitled to receive remuneration for driving the vehicle in addition to and separate from the amount he is paid for providing the vehicle, and”

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived, on division.

Mr. Rose for Mr. Barnett, seconded by Mr. Peters, moved,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended by deleting from Clause 1 lines 1 to 8 at page 4 and substituting therefor the following:

“(b) a fisherman who is engaged in commercial fishing and accepting or receiving payment, according to the volume and price of fish caught and delivered, from a commercial buyer of fish, whether such fisherman (i) owns and operates his own fishing vessel, provided he as master-owner of a fishing vessel does not employ or engage more than two additional fishermen who share in the proceeds of the fishing voyages, or (ii) shares in the operation of a fishing vessel owned by another person and receives in payment for his services a share or portion of the proceeds of the fishing voyages, or (iii) operates a fishing vessel owned by another person under a rental agreement or conditional sale agreement or any other form of oral or written agreement, or (iv) receives wages for all or part of his employment on a fishing vessel or in fitting out a fishing vessel on which he will be employed.”

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.

Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. McCleave, moved,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended by deleting lines 15 to 22 on page 4 thereof and substituting therefor:

““employee” means any person employed by an employer and includes a dependent contractor and a private constable, but does not include a manager or supervisor or any other person who, in the opinion of the Board, performs management functions or is

employed in a confidential capacity in matters relating to industrial relations;"

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.

Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. McCleave, moved,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended by deleting lines 33 to 40 on page 17 thereof.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was negated, on division.

Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Hales, moved,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended by deleting line 44 on page 35 thereof and substituting therefor:

"logical change, or"

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. Danforth, moved,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 34 on page 44 and substituting therefor the following:

"Revocable Check Off

162.(1) Any employee who is represented by a bargaining agent may authorize his employer in writing, at any time after the date on which the bargaining agent becomes entitled to represent him, to deduct from his wages the amount of the regular monthly membership or union dues payable by him to the bargaining agent and to remit that amount to

(a) the bargaining agent; or

(b) the registered Canadian charitable organization, as defined in the *Income Tax Act*, designated by the employee,

and the employer shall deduct and remit that amount in accordance with the authorization.

(2) An employee may, by notice in writing to his employer, revoke an authorization given by him pursuant to subsection (1), and that revocation shall have effect thirty days from the date upon which it is received by the employer.

(3) For the purpose of exercising any rights he may have under this Part, an employee who exercises his right under paragraph (1)(b) shall not thereby lose the status of a member in good standing of the bargaining agent.

(4) No person shall discriminate against an employee who exercises his right under paragraph (1)(b) either in regard to employment or any term or condition of employment or in regard to membership, for the purpose of exercising any rights he may have under

this Part, in the bargaining agent or any term or condition of membership.

(5) Nothing in a collective agreement that is inconsistent with the provisions of subsection (1) is valid."

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was negated, on division.

Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Flemming, moved,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended by deleting lines 45 to 48 on page 63 thereof and substituting therefor:

"194. (1) Except with the consent in writing of the Minister, which shall not be unreasonably withheld, no prosecution shall be instituted in respect of an offence under this Part.

(2) Where the Minister withholds his consent, he shall do so in writing within two weeks after the application for his consent and shall state his reasons therefor."

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was negated, on division.

Mr. Alexander, seconded by Flemming, moved,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended by inserting therein, next after the heading "Promotion of Industrial Peace" where the same appears above line 1 on page 64, the following:

"194A. For the better assuring that industrial relations continuously serve the promotion of the common well-being as well for the better promoting of industrial peace in the public interest, the Minister shall promote and encourage, in the field of labour-management relations,

(a) research in the social, political, economic, legal, psychological and other aspects of such relations, including employer and employee organization, personnel administration, social security, and labour legislation;

(b) full discussion and the exchange of ideas regarding the planning and conduct of such research;

(c) the public dissemination of significant results of such research;

(d) the improvement of the materials and methods of instruction used in such research; and

(e) the planning, supervision, co-ordination, analysis, and appraisal of industrial relations for the purpose of securing the most efficient co-operation of all groups and persons engaged in the production and distribution of goods and the provision of services."

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was negated, on division.

And the House having proceeded to the deferred division on the motion of Mr. Rose, for Mr. Barnett, seconded by Mr. Peters,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the

Canada Labour Code, be amended by deleting from Clause 1 lines 1 to 8 at page 4 and substituting therefor the following:

"(b) a fisherman who is engaged in commercial fishing and accepting or receiving payment, according to the volume and price of fish caught and delivered, from a commercial buyer of fish, whether such fisherman (i) owns and operates his own fishing vessel, provided he as master-owner of a fishing vessel does not employ or engage more than two additional fishermen who share in the proceeds of the fishing voyages, or (ii) shares in the operation of a fishing

vessel owned by another person and receives in payment for his services a share or portion of the proceeds of the fishing voyages, or (iii) operates a fishing vessel owned by another person under a rental agreement or conditional sale agreement or any other form of oral or written agreement, or (iv) receives wages for all or part of his employment on a fishing vessel or in fitting out a fishing vessel on which he will be employed."

And the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 46)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,
Alexander,
Alkenbrack,
Baldwin,
Bell,
Brewin,
Broadbent,
Coates,
Danforth,
Fairweather,
Flemming,

Fortin,
Gilbert,
Gleave,
Grills,
Gundlock,
Hales,
Harkness,
Hees,
Knight,
Knowles (Winnipeg
North Centre),

Knowles (Norfolk-
Haldimand),
Lambert
(Edmonton West),
Latulippe,
Lewis,
MacInnis (Mrs.),
MacLean,
Macquarrie,
McCleave,
McCutcheon,

McGrath,
Marshall,
Matte,
Mazankowski,
Monteith,
Muir,
Nystrom,
Peddle,
Peters,
Rock,
Rondeau,
Rose,

Rowland,
Saltsman,
Southam,
Stanfield,
Tétrault,
Thomas
(Moncton),
Thomson
(Battleford-
Kindersley),
Winch,
Woolliams—51.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,
Badanai,
Basford,
Béchar, d,
Benson,
Blair,
Blouin,
Borrie,
Boulanger,
Breau,
Buchanan,
Caccia,
Cafik,
Chappell,
Clermont,
Comtois,
Corbin,
Côté
(Richelieu),
Crossman,
Cullen,
Danson,
Davis,

Deachman,
Deakon,
Drury,
Duquet,
Éthier,
Forget,
Foster,
Francis,
Gibson,
Gillespie,
Goode,
Gray,
Guilbault,
Haidasz,
Hellyer,
Hogarth,
Hymmen,
Jerome,
Kaplan,
Lajoie,
Lang
(Saskatoon-
Humboldt),

Langlois,
Laniel,
La Salle,
Leblanc
(Laurier),
Lefebvre,
Legault,
Lessard
(LaSalle),
L'Heureux,
Loiselle,
Macdonald
(Rosedale),
MacEachen,
MacGuigan,
Mackasey,
McBride,
McNulty,
Mahoney,
Major,
Marchand
(Langelier),

Marchand
(Kamloops-
Cariboo),
Munro,
O'Connell,
Orange,
Osler,
Pelletier,
Pepin,
Perrault,
Portelance,
Pringle,
Prud'homme,
Reid,
Richard,
Richardson,
Rochon,
Roy
(Laval),
Serré,
Sharp,

Smith
(Northumberland-
Miramichi),
Smith
(Saint-Jean),
Stafford,
Stanbury,
Sulatycky,
Thomas
(Maisonneuve-
Rosemont),
Trudeau,
Trudel,
Turner
(London East),
Wahn,
Walker,
Watson,
Whelan,
Whiting,
Yanakis—94.

And the House having proceeded to the deferred division on the motion of Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. McCleave,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended by deleting lines 15 to 22 on page 4 thereof and substituting therefor:

““employee” means any person employed by an employer and includes a dependent contractor and a private constable, but does not include a manager or

supervisor or any other person who, in the opinion of the Board, performs management functions or is employed in a confidential capacity in matters relating to industrial relations;”

And the question being put on the said motion, it was negated on the following division:

(Division No. 47)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,
Alexander,
Alkenbrack,
Baldwin,
Bell,
Coates,
Danforth,
Fairweather,

Flemming,
Fortin,
Grills,
Gundlock,
Hales,
Harkness,
Hees,

Knowles (Norfolk-
Haldimand),
Lambert
(Edmonton West),
Latulippe,
MacLean,
Macquarrie,
McCleave,

McCutcheon,
McGrath,
Marshall,
Matte,
Mazankowski,
Monteith,
Muir,
Peddle,

Rock,
Rondeau,
Southam,
Stanfield,
Tétrault,
Thomas
(Moncton),
Woolliams—36.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,
Badanai,
Basford,
Béchar,
Benson,
Blair,
Blouin,
Borrie,
Boulanger,
Breau,
Brewin,
Broadbent,
Buchanan,
Burton,
Caccia,
Cafik,
Chappell,
Clermont,
Comtois,
Corbin,
Côté (Richelieu),
Crossman,
Cullen,
Danson,
Davis,

Deachman,
Deakon,
Drury,
Duquet,
Éthier,
Forget,
Foster,
Francis,
Gibson,
Gilbert,
Gillespie,
Gleave,
Goode,
Goyer,
Gray,
Guilbault,
Haidasz,
Hellyer,
Hogarth,
Hymmen,
Jerome,
Kaplan,
Knight,
Knowles (Winnipeg
North Centre),

Lajoie,
Lang (Saskatoon-
Humboldt),
Langlois,
Laniel,
La Salle,
Leblanc (Laurier),
Lefebvre,
Legault,
Lessard (LaSalle),
Lewis,
L'Heureux,
Loiselle,
Macdonald
(Rosedale),
MacEachen,
MacGuigan,
MacInnis (Mrs.),
Mackasey,
McBride,
McNulty,
Mahoney,
Major,
Marchand
(Langelier),

Marchand
(Kamloops-
Cariboo),
Munro,
Nystrom,
O'Connell,
Orange,
Osler,
Pelletier,
Pepin,
Perrault,
Peters,
Portelance,
Pringle,
Prud'homme,
Reid,
Richard,
Richardson,
Rochon,
Rose,
Rowland,
Roy (Laval),
Saltsman,
Serré,
Sharp,

Smith
(Northumberland-
Miramichi),
Smith
(Saint-Jean),
Stafford,
Stanbury,
Sulatycky,
Thomas
(Maisonneuve-
Rosemont),
Thomson
(Battleford-
Kindersley),
Trudeau,
Trudel,
Turner
(London East),
Wahn,
Walker,
Watson,
Whelan,
Whiting,
Winch,
Yanakis—111.

And the House having proceeded to the deferred division on the motion of Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Hales,—That Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended by deleting line 44 on page 35 thereof and substituting therefor:

“logical change, or”.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was negated on the following division:

(Division No. 48)

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken,
Alexander,
Alkenbrack,
Baldwin,
Bell,
Coates,
Danforth,
Fairweather,

Flemming,
Fortin,
Grills,
Gundlock,
Hales,
Harkness,
Hees,
Hellyer,

Knowles (Norfolk-
Haldimand),
Lambert
(Edmonton West),
Latulippe,
MacLean,
Macquarrie,
McCleave,

McCutcheon,
McGrath,
Marshall,
Matte,
Mazankowski,
Monteith,
Muir,
Peddle,

Rock,
Rondeau,
Southam,
Stanfield,
Tétrault,
Thomas
(Moncton)—36.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand,	Deachman,	Lajoie,	Marchand	Smith
Badanai,	Deakon,	Lang (Saskatoon-	(Kamloops-	(Northumberland-
Basford,	Drury,	Humboldt),	Cariboo),	Miramichi),
Béchar,	Duquet,	Langlois,	Munro,	Smith
Benson,	Éthier,	Laniel,	Nystrom,	(Saint-Jean),
Blair,	Forget,	La Salle,	O'Connell,	Stafford,
Blouin,	Foster,	Leblanc (Laurier),	Orange,	Stanbury,
Borrie,	Francis,	Lefebvre,	Osler,	Sulatycky,
Boulanger,	Gibson,	Legault,	Pelletier,	Thomas
Breau,	Gilbert,	Lessard (LaSalle),	Pepin,	(Maisonneuve-
Brewin,	Gillespie,	Lewis,	Perrault,	Rosemont),
Broadbent,	Gleave,	L'Heureux,	Peters,	Thomson
Buchanan,	Goode,	Loiselle,	Portelance,	(Battleford-
Burton,	Goyer,	Macdonald	Pringle,	Kindersley),
Caccia,	Gray,	(Rosedale),	Prud'homme,	Trudeau,
Cafk,	Guay (St. Boniface),	MacEachen,	Reid,	Trudel,
Chappell,	Gullbault,	MacGuigan,	Richard,	Turner
Clermont,	Haidasz,	MacInnis (Mrs.),	Richardson,	(London East),
Comtois,	Hogarth,	Mackasey,	Rochon,	Wahn,
Corbin,	Hymmen,	McBride,	Rose,	Walker,
Côté (Richelieu),	Jerome,	McNulty,	Rowland,	Watson,
Crossman,	Kaplan,	Mahoney,	Roy (Laval),	Whelan,
Cullen,	Knight,	Major,	Saltsman,	Whiting,
Danson,	Knowles (Winnipeg	Marchand	Serré,	Winch,
Davis,	North Centre),	(Langelier),	Sharp,	Yanakis—111.

On motion of Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, the said bill was concurred in at the report stage.

By unanimous consent, Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And the question being put on the said motion it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time, on division, and passed.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That upon completion of the consideration of Private Members' Business, this House stands adjourned until 2.00 o'clock p.m., Tuesday, July 4, 1972.

[At 4.00 o'clock p.m. Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

By unanimous consent, order numbered one was allowed to stand.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration of Bill C-21, An Act to amend

the Canada Labour Code (provision for ten general holidays with pay);

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mr. Peters, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

And debate arising thereon;

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed the following Bills, without any amendment:

Bill C-195, An Act to amend the Adult Occupational Training Act.

Bill C-204, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act.

Mr. Speaker communicated to the House the following letter:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
OTTAWA

30 June 1972

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Roland A. Ritchie, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 30th day

of June, at 4.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

ANDRÉ GARNEAU

Administrative Secretary to the Governor General.

The Honourable

The Speaker of the House of Commons.

A Message was received from the Honourable Mr. Justice Roland A. Ritchie, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, desiring the immediate attendance of the House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went to the Senate Chamber.

And being returned;

Mr. Speaker reported that, when the House did attend the Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, His Honour was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bills:

Bill C-195, An Act to amend the Adult Occupational Training Act.—Chapter No. 14.

Bill C-204, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act.—Chapter 16.

Bill S-3, An Act to change the names of the Territorial Court of the Yukon Territory and the Territorial Court of the Northwest Territories.—Chapter No. 17.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had addressed the Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR:

"The Commons of Canada have voted Supplies required to enable the Government to defray certain expenses of the public service.

"In the name of the Commons I present to Your Honour the following Bill:

'An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service, for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1973.'—Bill C-221, Chapter No. 15.

"To which Bill I humbly request Your Honour's Assent."

Whereupon, the Clerk of the Senate, by Command of the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, did say:

"In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her Loyal Subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill."

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

Minutes of Proceedings of the Royal Society of Canada, 1971 and Calendar 1970-71 pursuant to section 9 of An Act to Incorporate the Royal Society of Canada, chapter 46, Statutes of Canada, 1883. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/233.

Financial Statement of the Royal Society of Canada, certified by the Auditors, for the period ended February 29, 1972.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/233A.

By Mr. Macdonald, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 5 of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources Act, Chapter E-6, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/9.

By Mr. Macdonald,—Report of Uranium Canada, Limited, together with the Accounts and Financial Statements for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/407.

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Return to an Order of the House, dated June 28, 1972, for copies of all contracts dealing with publicity and/or information entered into by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in the fiscal years 1970-71 and 1971-72.—(Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 48).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/48.

By Mr. MacEachen,—Return to an Address, dated June 28, 1972, to His Excellency the Governor General, for a copy of the Agreement or an exchange of correspondence between the Government of Great Britain and the Government of Canada governing the use and terms of such use of that portion of the Suffield experimental station in Alberta for training purposes by British troops, including British armoured vehicles.—(Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 58).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/58.

By Mr. Mackasey, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Unemployment Insurance Commission for the period April 1, 1971 to December 31, 1971 pursuant to section 130(2) of the Unemployment Insur-

ance Act, chapter 48, Statutes of Canada 1970-71-72. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/250.

By Mr. O'Connell, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on Proceedings under Part III of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 75 of the Canada Labour Code, chapter L-1, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/82.

By Mr. Pelletier, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1970, pursuant to section 6 of the Department of State Act, chapter S-15, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/24.

By Mr. Pelletier,—Report of the National Librarian for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 13 of the National Library Act, chapter N-11, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/169.

By Mr. Pelletier, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,—Report of the Canadian Radio-Television Commission for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 31 of the Broadcasting Act, chapter B-11, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/286.

By Mr. Richardson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of Crown Assets Disposal Corporation, including its Accounts and Financial Statements, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 14 of the Surplus Crown Assets Act, chapter S-20, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/117.

By Mr. Richardson,—Report of Canadian Arsenals Limited, including its Accounts and Financial Statements for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/85.

By Mr. Stanbury, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation, including its Accounts and Financial Statements for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/102.

At 5.10 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 4, 1972, at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Special Order made Friday, June 30, 1972.

No. 86

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, JULY 4, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Duquet, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, laid upon the Table,—Copy of Final Report entitled "The Canadian Northwest Transportation Study", dated November, 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-4/50.

Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, was again considered at the report stage.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Fairweather, seconded by Mr. Hales,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting lines 24 to 27 on page 2 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"dustries in Canada;

(e) the compatibility of the acquisition with national industrial and economic policies; and

(f) after consultation by the Minister with each province that is likely to be significantly affected by an assessment made by him pursuant to section 6, the effect of the acquisition on the industrial and economic policies of each such province."

And on the motion of Mr. Saltsman, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by renumbering present Clause 6 as Clause "6(1)" and adding the following immediately thereafter:

"(2) In conducting a review the Minister shall consult with the appointed representative of the province or provinces concerned with the proposed acquisition."

After further debate;

By unanimous consent, debate on the said motions was adjourned.

Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions

of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting therefrom in paragraph (i) of subsection (2) of Clause 3 the figure "25%" and substituting therefore the figure "5%" and that paragraph (ii) of subsection (2) of Clause 3 be amended by deleting therefrom the figure "40%" and substituting the figure "20%".

After debate thereon, the said debate was interrupted.

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

By unanimous consent, orders numbered one and two were allowed to stand.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration of Bill C-23, An Act to amend the Immigration Appeal Board Act;

Mr. Haidasz, seconded by Mr. Whelan, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

And debate arising thereon;

STATEMENT BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps honourable Members would give the Chair indulgence for just one moment. In order that there is no misunderstanding in the future the Chair would like to point out some doubt about the procedural acceptability of this bill. The matter is academic now in that it is six o'clock, but were it to proceed further I just wanted to point out at this point that it does seem to the Chair that Clauses (1) and (2) involve an expenditure of money while there is no Royal Recommendation attached to the bill. I think the Chair's opinion is confirmed by the words of the honourable Member for Edmonton West.

The honourable Member was not arguing about acceptability in a procedural way but did suggest that commissioners did cost money. I think that if Clauses (1) and (2) were implemented we would then find a difficult procedural situation. I mention this at this point in order that we do not create a precedence and difficulty in the future.

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Consideration was resumed at the report stage of Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enter-

prises by certain persons, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

The adjourned debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Fairweather, seconded by Mr. Hales,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting lines 24 to 27 on page 2 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"dustries in Canada;

(e) the compatibility of the acquisition with national industrial and economic policies; and

(f) after consultation by the Minister with each province that is likely to be significantly affected by an assessment made by him pursuant to section 6, the effect of the acquisition on the industrial and economic policies of each such province."

And on the motion of Mr. Saltsman, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by renumbering present Clause 6 as Clause "6(1)" and adding the following immediately thereafter:

"(2) In conducting a review the Minister shall consult with the appointed representative of the province or provinces concerned with the proposed acquisition."

After further debate, by unanimous consent, motion numbered 4 was withdrawn; and

Consequently, pursuant to Statement by Mr. Speaker on June 26, 1972, motion numbered 18 was deemed to have been dropped.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by striking out lines 25 to 27 on page 2 and substituting the following:

(e) the compatibility of the acquisition with national industrial and economic policies, taking into consideration industrial and economic policies of any province likely to be significantly affected by the acquisition.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre),—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting therefrom in paragraph (i) of subsection (2) of

Clause 3 the figure "25%" and substituting therefor the figure "5%" and that paragraph (ii) of subsection (2) of Clause 3 be amended by deleting therefrom the figure "40%" and substituting the figure "20%".

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. MacLean, moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by striking out the figure "5" where the same appears in line 14 on page 5, line 10 on page 6, and line 34 on page 7, and substituting therefor in each and every instance the figure "10".

Mr. Hees for Mr. Horner, seconded by Mr. Alexander, moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting the figure of 5% in line 10 on page 6 and substituting the figure 10%.

Mr. Hees for Mr. Horner, seconded by Mr. Alexander, moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting the figure 20% in line 16 on page 6 and substituting the figure of 40%.

Mr. Hees for Mr. Horner, seconded by Mr. Alexander, moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended as follows:

in subparagraph 3(3)(c) by substituting the figure 10% for the figure 5% in line 34; and
in line 39 by substituting the figure 40% for the figure 20%.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motions, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.

STATEMENT BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is the understanding of the Chair that when Mr. Speaker reviewed the matter when the report stage was first called, he did not make suggestions beyond the stage that we have just completed. I know that if honourable Members are not in accord, they will so indicate to the Chair, but we might now take motions Nos. 10 and 11. The vote on motion No. 10 would also dispose of motion No. 11. Motion No. 12 might then be considered and disposed of separately. It is also suggested that motions Nos. 13 to 16 should be combined for the purposes of debate. If necessary, motions Nos. 13 and 14 might be voted upon separately. A vote on motion No. 15 would also dispose of motion No. 16. Motion No. 17 might be considered and disposed

of separately. Motion No. 18 has been withdrawn. I will not go beyond that point at this time and if honourable Members have any suggestion on the proposed groupings, they might indicate that to the Chair. Otherwise we could proceed with motions Nos. 10 and 11.

Mr. McCleave, seconded by Mr. Alexander, moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting paragraph 3(5)(d) and substituting therefor the following:

"(d) the acquisition of any right described in paragraph (c) shall be deemed to constitute the acquisition of the shares or property to which the right relates except where it is established that the right was acquired for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the person by whom it was acquired in respect of a loan made by him, or for the purpose of use by the person by whom it was acquired in the normal course of carrying on a leasing business, and not for any purpose related to the provisions of this Act;"

Mr. McCleave, seconded by Mr. Alexander, moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting paragraph 3(5)(e) and substituting therefor the following:

"(e) the acquisition of a leasehold interest in any property used in carrying on a business shall be deemed to constitute the acquisition of that property except where it is established that the interest was acquired from a dealer in such property or from a person owing such property in the normal course of carrying on a leasing business, or except where it is established that the person by whom the interest was acquired had previously owned such property;"

And debate arising thereon;

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed the following bills without any amendment:

Bill C-203, An Act to amend the Representation Commissioner Act.

Bill C-215, An Act to amend the Pension Act.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

At 10.03 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Trudeau, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Summary of Orders in Council passed during the month of March, 1972. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/353.

By Mr. Basford, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the National Capital Commission, for

the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, together with the Accounts and Financial Statements, pursuant to section 75(3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/181.

By Mr. Gillespie, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Science Council of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 19 of the Science Council of Canada Act, chapter S-5, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/234.

At 10.25 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 87

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, JULY 5, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following three Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 1—*Mr. Orlikow*

1. In each of the past three years (a) how much money was distributed in the form of grants for research into the problems of mental health (b) how many grants were made to projects in each province (c) what was the total amount of the grants paid out in each province?

2. In each of the past three years (a) how many requests for grants for research into the problems of mental health were made by researchers in each province (b) what was the dollar value of the requests from each province?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/1.

No. 171—*Mr. Schumacher*

1. Does the federal government contribute financially to a body or organization known as the Canada Council for Social Development, or known under any other name, set up for the purposes of providing permanent programmes for transient youth and, if so, what is the correct name, address and authority of such body or bodies?

2. What specifically are the aims, purposes and programmes administered by such body or bodies?

3. What is the cost of each programme and in each case, how much is borne by the federal government?

4. Where specifically are such programmes being carried out, and by whom in each case?

5. What remuneration of any nature is paid to any individual or individuals in each case?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/171.

No. 461—*Mr. Nystrom*

Are there any trade development programmes which are identified with a particular region of Canada and, if so, what are examples of programmes which have specific benefits to the Province of British Columbia, to the Prairies, to the Province of Quebec and to the Atlantic Region?—Sessional Paper No. 284-2/461.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

By unanimous consent, Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, introduced Bill C-230, An Act to provide for the resumption of the operation of the ports of Montreal, Trois-Rivières and Quebec, which was read the first time.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered that the said bill be considered at the second reading stage at 4.30 o'clock p.m., this day.

Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, was again considered at the report stage.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. McCleave, seconded by Mr. Alexander,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting paragraph 3(5)(d) and substituting therefor the following:

“(d) the acquisition of any right described in paragraph (c) shall be deemed to constitute the acquisition of the shares or property to which the right relates except where it is established that the right was acquired for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the person by whom it was acquired in respect of a loan made by him, or for the purpose of use by the person by whom it was acquired in the normal course of carrying on a leasing business, and not for any purpose related to the provisions of this Act;”.

And on the motion of Mr. McCleave, seconded by Mr. Alexander,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting paragraph 3(5)(e) and substituting therefor the following:

“(e) the acquisition of a leasehold interest in any property used in carrying on a business shall be deemed to constitute the acquisition of that property except where it is established that the interest was acquired from a dealer in such property or from a person owning such property in the normal course of carrying on a leasing business, or except where it is established that the person by whom the interest was acquired had previously owned such property;”.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motions, it was negatived, on division.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. McCleave, moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting line 25 on page 12 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

“based on such information and evidence; and, where the opinion is that the person is not a non-eligible

person, the Minister and his successors in office shall, upon such information and evidence, be bound by that opinion.”

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived, on division.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. Fairweather, moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by inserting therein, next after line 34 on page 12 thereof, the following:

“(b) a business enterprise carried on by a corporation with provincial objects that is incorporated under the laws of a province and is excluded by name from the application of this Act by an order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council of that province;”

and by relettering subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was negatived, on division.

Mr. Rowland, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That Bill C-201, An Act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting therefrom paragraph (c) of subsection (1) of Clause 4.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.

At 4.30 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Special Order made this day, the Order being read for the second reading and reference to a Committee of the Whole House of Bill C-230, An Act to provide for the resumption of the operation of the ports of Montreal, Trois-Rivières and Quebec;

Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

And debate arising thereon;

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That the House shall meet at 8.00 o'clock p.m., for the purpose of resuming consideration of the second reading of Bill C-230.

At 8.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Special Order made earlier this day, debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-230, An Act to provide for the resumption of the operation of the ports of Montreal, Trois-Rivières and Quebec, be now read a second time and be referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and ordered for consideration in Committee of the Whole at the next sitting of the House.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with
the Clerk of the House*

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Richardson, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report of the Canadian Commercial Corporation, including its Accounts and Financial Statements, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 13(1) of the Canadian Commercial Corporation Act, chapter C-6, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/88.

At 9.50 o'clock p.m., on motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Mackasey, the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 88

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, JULY 6, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Trudeau, seconded by Mr. Pepin, moved,—That when the House adjourns following the third reading and passing of Bills C-170 and C-201 or, at the ordinary time of daily adjournment on Friday, July 7, 1972, as the case may be, it shall stand adjourned until a time to be fixed by Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Government, when the House may meet for the purpose of the giving of Royal Assent to any bills that have not been given Royal Assent;

And that, after the giving of Royal Assent to any such bills or in the event the House does not meet for that purpose, the House shall be adjourned or stand adjourned, as the case may be, until September 28, 1972, provided that at any time prior to that date, if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the Government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time;

And that, in the event of Mr. Speaker's being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker or the Deputy Chairman of Committees shall act in his stead for all purposes of this order.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Sharp, moved in amendment thereto,—That the motion be amended by deleting all the words preceding the phrase "it shall stand adjourned" and substituting therefore the following words:

"That, when the House adjourns at the ordinary time of daily adjournment on Friday, July 7, 1972, provided that Royal Assent has been given to bill C-230,"

And the question being put on the said amendment, it was agreed to.

And the question being put on the main motion, as amended, it was agreed to and is as follows:

That, when the House adjourns at the ordinary time of daily adjournment on Friday, July 7, 1972, provided that Royal Assent has been given to Bill C-230, it shall stand adjourned until a time to be fixed by Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Government, when the House may meet for the purpose of the giving of Royal Assent to any bills that have not been given Royal Assent;

And that, after the giving of Royal Assent to any such bills or in the event the House does not meet for that

purpose, the House shall be adjourned or stand adjourned, as the case may be, until September 28, 1972, provided that at any time prior to that date, if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the Government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an early time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time;

And that, in the event of Mr. Speaker's being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker or the Deputy Chairman of Committees shall act in his stead for all purposes of this order.

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to "Motions".

By unanimous consent on the motion of Mr. Basford, seconded by Mr. Côté (Longueuil), it was ordered,—That the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development be authorized to hear representations from the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Bill C-230, An Act to provide for the resumption of the operation of the ports of Montreal, Trois-Rivières and Quebec, and progress having been made and reported, the Committee obtained leave to consider it again later this day.

[*Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)*]

[*Notices of Motions (Papers)*]

Mrs. MacInnis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report undertaken in the Department of Agriculture on the United States Internal Food-Aid Program and its application to Canada.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 3*).

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

The House resumed consideration in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-230, An Act to provide for the resumption of the operation of the ports of Montreal, Trois-Rivières and Quebec, which was reported without amendment and concurred in at the report stage.

Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. Drury, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a third time and do pass.

And on the motion of Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mrs. MacInnis, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-170 be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs for the purpose of reconsidering the portions of Clause 6 and of such other clauses that impose a means or income test for the receipt of benefits under the said Bill.

And debate continuing;

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, without any amendment.

(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)

By unanimous consent at 9.57 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Messrs. McBride, Murphy, Foster, Turner (London East), Deakon and Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay) for Messrs. Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi), Sulatycky, Whelan, Major, Orange and Goode on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Statement of Expenditures and Financial Commitments made under the Veterans' Land Act for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 49 of the said Act, chapter V-4, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/256.

At 10.18 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 89

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, JULY 7, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. Foster, seconded by Mr. De Bané, the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, presented to the House on Monday, June 26, 1972, was concurred in.

Mr. Pepin, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copy of News Release, dated July 7, 1972, together with Report of the Textile and Clothing Board, dated December 16, 1971, relative to the inquiry ordered by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce respecting acrylic yarns. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-4/152.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—

That Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children, be now read a third time and do pass.

And on the motion of Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), seconded by Mrs. MacInnis, in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-170 be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs for the purpose of reconsidering the portions of Clause 6 and of such other clauses that impose a means or income test for the receipt of benefits under the said Bill.

After further debate, the question being put on the said proposed amendment, it was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 49)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alkenbrack,
Bell,
Benjamin,
Brewin,
Broadbent,
Burton,
Carter,

Coates,
Crouse,
Danforth,
Diefenbaker,
Forrestall,
Gilbert,
Grills,

Gundlock,
Harkness,
Hellyer,
Knight,
Knowles (Winnipeg
North Centre),
Lambert
(Edmonton West),

Latulippe,
Lewis,
MacInnis (Mrs.),
MacLean,
Macquarrie,
McCleave,
Marshall,

Mather,
Monteith,
Nowlan,
Nystrom,
Peters,
Saltsman,
Scott,
Yewchuk—35.

NAYS

Messrs.

Andras,	Deakon,	Lang	Morison,	Stafford,
Barrett,	De Bané,	(Saskatoon-	Munro,	Stanbury,
Basford,	Dupras,	Humboldt),	Murphy,	Stewart
Benson,	Éthier,	Lefebvre,	O'Connell,	(Cochrane),
Blair,	Forget,	Legault,	Orange,	Sulatycky,
Blouin,	Francis,	Loiselle,	Osler,	Sullivan,
Boulanger,	Guay	Macdonald	Prud'homme,	Turner
Breau,	(St. Boniface),	(Rosedale),	Richard,	(London East),
Cafik,	Guilbault,	MacGuigan,	Rochon,	Wahn,
Chrétien,	Haidasz,	McBride,	Roy	Watson,
Clermont,	Hopkins,	McNulty,	(Laval),	Weatherhead,
Côté	Hymmen,	Marchand	Smith	Whelan,
(Richelieu),	Lajoie,	(Kamloops-	(Saint-Jean),	Whiting—56.
Deachman,		Cariboo),		

Mr. Speaker communicated to the House the following letter:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
OTTAWA

July 7, 1972

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Wishart F. Spence, O.B.E., Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 7th day of July, at 4.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,

ANDRÉ GARNEAU,

Administrative Secretary to the Governor General.

The Honourable

The Speaker of the House of Commons.

[(Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4))]

(Notices of Motions)

Mr. MacGuigan, seconded by Mr. Blair, moved,—That the policy of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation of preventing or delaying the showing in Windsor of Corporation-produced television series or programs in order to sell these series or programs more profitably to broadcasting networks in the United States be referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts for investigation and report.—*(Notice of Motion No. 12).*

And debate arising thereon;

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed the following bills, without any amendment:

Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act.

Bill C-230, An Act to provide for the resumption of the operation of the ports of Montreal, Trois-Rivières and Quebec.

A Message was received from the Honourable Wishart F. Spence, O.B.E., Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy Governor General, desiring the immediate attendance of the House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker went with the House to the Senate Chamber.

And being returned;

Mr. Speaker reported that when the House did attend the Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, His Honour was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bills:

Bill C-183, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code.—Chapter No. 18.

Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Farm Credit Act.—Chapter No. 19.

Bill C-215, An Act to amend the Pension Act.—Chapter No. 20.

Bill C-230, An Act to provide for the resumption of the operation of the ports of Montreal, Trois-Rivières and Quebec.—Chapter No. 22.

Bill C-203, An Act to amend the Representation Commissioner Act.—Chapter No. 21.

At 5.06 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Order made Thursday, July 6, 1972, the House adjourned until Thursday, September 28, 1972, at 2.00 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 90

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a communication notifying him that a vacancy had occurred in the representation, namely:

David Anderson, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Esquimalt-Saanich, by resignation.

And that he had addressed his warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer for the issue of a new Writ of Election for the said Electoral District.

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF ESQUIMALT-SAANICH
HOUSE OF COMMONS

To the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons:

I hereby tender my resignation effective this date as a Member of the House of Commons for the constituency of Esquimalt-Saanich.

David Anderson (L.S.)

Witness: K. Mitchell

Witness: R. Places

July 24, 1972.

Pursuant to section 2 of Standing Order 42, Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-231, An Act to provide for the resumption and continuation of longshoring and grain handling operations and operations related to longshoring or grain handling at ports on the west coast of Canada, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading later this day.

The text of the Message and recommendation of the Governor General printed pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure to provide for the resumption and continuation of longshoring and grain handling operations and operations related to longshoring or grain handling at ports on the west coast of Canada, and to provide under the circumstances prescribed, that mediators may be appointed by the Governor in Council to mediate the matters in dispute between the employers' association or each company and the union and, to bring about agreement between them.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That Bill C-231, An Act to provide for the resumption and continuation of longshoring and grain handling operations and operations related to longshoring or grain handling at ports on the west coast of Canada, be referred to a Committee of the Whole House and;

That the hour for Private Members' Business be suspended.

Pursuant to Order made earlier this day, the Order being read for the second reading and reference to a Committee of the Whole House of Bill C-231, An Act to provide for the resumption and continuation of longshoring and grain handling operations and operations related to longshoring or grain handling at ports on the west coast of Canada;

Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. Benson, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and considered in Committee of the Whole and progress having been made and reported the Committee obtained leave to consider it again at the next sitting of the House.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Legault for Mr. Forget on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Chrétien, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copy of Ordinances, chapters 1 to 16, assented to June 30, 1972, pursuant to section 16(1) of the Northwest Territories Act, chapter N-22, R.S.C., 1970, together

with a copy of Order in Council P.C. 1972-1850, dated August 24, 1972, approving same.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/200B.

By Mr. Goyer, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on the Administration of Part 1 of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 26 of the said Act, chapter R-11, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/231.

By Mr. Goyer,—Copy of Contract entered into between the Government of Canada and the Town of Westlock, in the Province of Alberta, pursuant to section 20(3) of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, chapter R-9, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/266D.

By Mr. Goyer,—Copy of a Contract between the Government of Canada and the Village of Nackawic, in the Province of New Brunswick, pursuant to subsection 3 of section 20 of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, chapter R-9, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/272.

By Mr. Goyer,—Copy of a Contract between the Government of Canada and the Town of Montague, in the Province of Prince Edward Island, pursuant to subsection 3 of section 20 of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, chapter R-9, R.S.C., 1970.—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/273A.

By Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Supplementary Return to an Order of the House, dated May 31, 1972, for copies of the 8 reports resulting from Summer 71 Information Canada Communications Research Project.—(Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 61).—Sessional Paper No. 284-3/61A.

By Mr. Munro, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on the Operation of Agreements with the Provinces under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to section 9 of the said Act, chapter H-8, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/157.

By Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Report on the Activities of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 3 of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations Act, chapter F-26, R.S.C., 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-6/3.

At 10.06 o'clock p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

No. 91

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

Bill C-231, An Act to provide for the resumption and continuation of longshoring and grain handling operations and operations related to longshoring or grain handling at ports on the west coast of Canada was again considered in Committee of the Whole, reported with amendments and concurred in, as amended, at the report stage.

Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

The sitting was suspended to the call of the Chair.

And the sitting having been resumed;

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed Bill C-231, An Act to provide for the resumption and continuation of longshoring and grain handling operations and operations

related to longshoring or grain handling at ports on the west coast of Canada, without any amendment.

Mr. Speaker communicated to the House the following letter:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
OTTAWA

September 1, 1972

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Emmett M. Hall, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber at 4.45 p.m. today, the 1st day of September, for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to a Bill and proroguing the Fourth Session of the Twenty-eighth Parliament of Canada.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,

ANDRÉ GARNEAU
Administrative Secretary to the Governor General.

The Honourable,
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

A Message was received from the Honourable Emmett M. Hall, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, desiring the immediate attendance of the House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker went with the House to the Senate Chamber where the Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, was pleased to give in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bill:

Bill C-231, An Act to provide for the resumption and continuation of longshoring and grain handling operations related to longshoring or grain handling at ports on the west coast of Canada.—Chapter No. 23.

After which, the Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Fourth Session of the Twenty-eighth Parliament with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The fourth session of the twenty-eighth Parliament was opened on February 17, 1972. Since that time you have enacted legislation and approved government actions of great importance to the prosperity and well-being of the Canada of to-day and of the future.

During this session, Canadians were honoured by a visit to Ottawa by the President of the United States and were encouraged by this reaffirmation of our traditional friendship with our closest neighbours.

Canada has continued to develop its relationships with all nations, great and small, in all spheres, economic, social, and political.

At home, our economy has continued to grow and has produced new employment at a rate exceeding that of any industrialized nation. During this session you have had placed before you measures designed to stimulate still further the economic growth of our land.

In this session you have addressed yourselves to the complexities of the Canadian federal democracy and have approved the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act.

You have also continued your work on behalf of the agricultural community. While the government has expanded our international markets for farm products, Parliament has amended the Farm Credit Act and the Canadian Wheat Board Act.

The social environment of Canada has been of much concern to you during this session. You have enacted amendments to the Criminal Law and the Government has announced its intentions to make more modern its policies on the control of the use of drugs. Both the

Opportunities for Youth Program and the Local Initiatives Program have been expanded and continued. The Government has also announced a New Horizons for the aged program. As further support for our older citizens, you have enacted a measure to increase the Old Age Security pensions.

During this session you have also approved two measures to improve the benefits provided for veterans and other persons affected by war.

You have been particularly concerned with the problems of industrialization. You have amended the Canada Labour Code as well as the Adult Occupational Training Act.

You have also been called upon to deal expeditiously with two serious industrial disputes and you have enacted measures to protect the national interest in those incidents.

During this session, both Houses of Parliament have permitted their Committees to continue the important task of reviewing government policy and administration.

Many other important initiatives have been approved. In addition, you have had placed before you measures concerning the national anthem, national parks, fair employment practices, income security, mortgage mechanisms, housing, representation, election expenses and many other important matters. In the future Parliament must apply itself with great vigour and diligence to these issues and to others as they develop.

Members of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the provision you have made for the public services in the previous and in the current fiscal year.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

May Divine Providence continue to bless our country.

After which His Honour the Speaker of the Senate said:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

It is the will and pleasure of the Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General that this Parliament be prorogued until the twenty-eighth day of September or to be here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until the twenty-eighth day of September.

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the
Clerk of the House*

The following paper having been deposited with the Clerk of the House was laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Pepin, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,

—Report of the Standards Council of Canada, including its financial statement, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 20 of the Standards Council of Canada Act, chapter 41, R.S.C., 1970, 1st Supplement. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 284-1/76.



CANADA

PROCLAMATION *re* DISSOLUTION

ROLAND MICHENER
[L.S.]

CANADA

ELIZABETH THE SECOND, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom, Canada and Her other Realms and Territories QUEEN, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith.

To OUR Beloved and Faithful the SENATORS of Canada, and the MEMBERS elected to serve in the House of Commons of Canada and to all whom these Presents may in anyway concern,

GREETING:

A PROCLAMATION

D. S. THORSON,
*Acting Deputy Attorney
General of Canada* } **W**HEREAS We have thought fit, by and with the
advice of Our Prime Minister of Canada, to
to dissolve the present Parliament of Canada.

NOW KNOW YE, that We do for that end publish this Our Royal Proclamation, and do hereby dissolve the said Parliament of Canada accordingly; and the Senators and the Members of the House of Commons are discharged from their meeting and attendance.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent and the Great Seal of Canada to be hereunto affixed. WITNESS: Our Right Trusty and Well-beloved Counsellor, Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of Our Order of Canada, Chancellor and Commander of Our Order of Military Merit upon whom We have conferred Our Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

AT OUR GOVERNMENT HOUSE, in Our City of Ottawa, this first day of September, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy-two and in the twenty-first year of Our Reign.

By Command,

G. F. OSBALDESTON
Deputy Registrar General of Canada

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN

LIST OF APPENDICES TO COMMONS JOURNALS—SESSION 1972

No. 1—Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements, Bill C-8: First Report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 and 2*), 61.

No. 2—Chief Electoral Officer, 1972-73 Main Estimates: First Report of Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issue No. 1*), 65.

No. 3—United Bank of Canada, Bill C-164: Second Report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issue No. 3*), 67.

No. 4—Constitution of Canada: Final Report of Special Joint Committee on the Constitution of Canada, with recommendations, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 18 of Second Session, Issues Nos. 1 to 94 of Third Session and Issue No. 1 of Fourth Session, 28th Parliament*), 67-193.

No. 5—Labour, 1972-73 Main Estimates: First Report of Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issue No. 1*), 205.

No. 6—Supplementary Estimates (B), 1971-72: First Report of Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 11*), 207.

No. 7—Auditor General, facilities and delay in report: First Report of Standing Committee on Public Accounts, with recommendation re draft bill, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 3*), 207-8.

No. 8—Justice, Law Reform Commission, Tax Review Board, 1972-73 Main Estimates: First Report of Justice and Legal Affairs Committee with its Printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 and 2*), 211.

No. 9—Public Service Commission, refusal to allow C.R.T.C. employee to seek political nomination: First Report of Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, with recommendations, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 3*), 221-2.

No. 10—Veterans Affairs, 1972-73 Main Estimates: First Report of Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 4*), 257.

No. 11—Correctional Services, Solicitor General, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1972-73 Main Estimates: Second Report of Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 3 to 5*), 283.

No. 12—Immigration Appeal Board, Manpower and Immigration, 1972-73 Main Estimates: Second Report of Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower Immigration with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 8*), 283.

No. 13—Criminal Law Amendment, Bill C-2: Third Report of Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, reporting Bill with amendments, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 5 to 7*), 289-90.

No. 14—Old Age Security Act amendment, Bill C-207: First Report of Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issue No. 5*), 296.

No. 15—Canadian International Development Agency, Defence Construction (1951) Limited, External Affairs, International Joint Commission, National Defence, 1972-73 Main Estimates: Second Report of Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 7 to 12 and 14*), 300.

LIST OF APPENDICES TO COMMONS JOURNALS—SESSION 1972—Con.

No. 16—Auditor General, Canadian Arsenals Limited, Canadian Commercial Corporation, Commissioner of Official Languages, Governor General and Lieutenant Governors, National Research Council, Privy Council, Public Service Staff Relations Board, Science and Technology Ministry, Science Council of Canada, Supply and Services, Treasury Board, 1972-73 Main Estimates: Second Report of Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1, 2, and 12 to 21*), 303.

No. 17—Canadian Radio-Television Commission, 1972-73 Main Estimates: Second Report of Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, with recommendations redecision on Mississauga cablevision, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 4 to 7*), 303-4.

No. 18—War Pensions and Allowances Acts amendment, Bill C-208: Second Report of Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issue No. 6*), 308.

No. 19—Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, National Capital Commission, Prices and Incomes Commission, Urban Affairs Ministry, 1972-73 Main Estimates: Second Report of Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 4, 6 and 7*), 311.

No. 20—House of Commons, Library of Parliament, Senate, 1972-73 Main Estimates: First Report of Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 3*), 311.

No. 21—Agriculture, Canadian Dairy Commission, Canadian Livestock Feed Board, Farm Credit Corporation, 1972-73 Main Estimates: First Report of Standing Committee on Agriculture with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 15*), 331.

No. 22—Atlantic Pilotage Authority, Canadian National Railways, Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation, Canadian Transport Commission, Communications, Great Lakes Pilotage Authority, Laurentian Pilotage Authority, National Harbours Board, Northern Transportation Company Limited, Pacific Pilotage Authority, St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, Transport, 1972-73 Main Estimates: Third Report of Standing Committee on Transport and Communications with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 2 to 9*), 335.

No. 23—Economic Council of Canada, Finance, Industry, Trade and Commerce, Insurance, National Revenue, Standards Council of Canada, Statistics Canada, Tariff Board, 1972-73 Main Estimates: Third Report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 4 to 16*), 341.

No. 24—Manpower and Immigration, Unemployment Insurance Commission, 1972-73 Main Estimates: Third Report of Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 2, 3 and 18*), 343.

No. 25—Cape Breton Development Corporation, Regional Economic Expansion, 1972-73 Main Estimates: First Report of Standing Committee on Regional Development with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 14*), 347.

No. 26—Adult Occupational Training Act amendment, Bill C-195: Fourth Report of Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issue No. 19*), 251.

No. 27—Family Income Security Plan, Bill C-170: Third Report of Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, reporting Bill with amendment, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 8 to 12*), 351.

LIST OF APPENDICES TO COMMONS JOURNALS—SESSION 1972—Concl.

No. 28—Auditor General's Report on Public Accounts for 1969-70 and evidence adduced in previous session: Second Report of Standing Committee on Public Accounts, with recommendations, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 44 to 57 of last session and Issue No. 5 of this session*), 365-70.

No. 29—Protection of Privacy, Bill C-6: Fourth Report of Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, reporting Bill with amendments, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 8 to 11*), 381-2.

No. 30—Canada Labour Code Act amendment, Bill C-183: Fifth Report of Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, reporting Bill with amendments, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 7 to 17 and 21 to 26*), 391-2.

No. 31—Railway passenger service in South Western Ontario: Fourth Report of Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, with recommendations, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 10 to 14*), 396.

No. 32—Foreign Takeovers Review, Bill C-201: Fourth Report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, reporting Bill with amendments, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 17 to 26*), 399-401.

No. 33—Farm Credit Act amendment, Bill C-5: Second Report of Standing Committee on Agriculture with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 16 to 23*), 421.

No. 34—Prisoners of war, pensions: Third Report of Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, with recommendations, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 5, 7, 8 and 9*), 426-8.

No. 35—Pension Act amendment, Bill C-215: Fourth Report of Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issue No. 10*), 435.

No. 36—White Paper entitled "Defence in the 70s": Third Report of Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1 to 6, 13 and 16 to 19*), 448-63.

No. 37—Auditor General's Report on Public Accounts for 1968-69 and evidence adduced in previous session: Third Report of Standing Committee on Public Accounts, with recommendations, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 1, 10, 13 to 17, 19, 53 and 58 of last session and Issues Nos. 8 and 9 of this session*), 465-71.

No. 38—Radio and television broadcasting of proceedings of the House and its Committees: Second Report of Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, with recommendations, with its printed Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 3 to 6 of Second Session, Issues Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 6 of Third Session and Issue No. 4 of Fourth Session*), 471-86.

**MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES
NOT REPORTED OR DEEMED REPORTED TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS:**

Agriculture Committee:

Issue 24: Canadian Wheat Board, annual and supplementary reports for 1968-69 and 1969-70 and annual report for 1970-71—(not reported).

Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee:

Issues 8, 9 and 10: Department of the Secretary of State, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

Fisheries and Forestry Committee:

Issue 1: Organization meeting and Department of the Environment, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

Issues 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9: Department of the Environment, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

Indian Affairs and Northern Development Committee:

Issue 1: Organization meeting and Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

Issues 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

Issue 6: Northern Canada Power Commission, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

Miscellaneous Estimates Committee:

Issues 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31: Public Service Commission, annual report for 1971—(not reported).

National Resources and Public Works Committee:

Issue 1: Organization meeting and Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

Issues 2 and 5: Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

Issues 3 and 4: National Energy Board, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

Issue 6: Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

Issue 7: Atomic Energy Control Board, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

Issue 8: Department of Public Works, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

Privileges and Elections Committee:

Issues 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6: The allegations concerning wiretapping and opening of mail of Members of Parliament—(not reported).

Issues 7 and 8: Bill C-211 (Election Expenses Act)—(not reported).

Public Accounts Committee:

Issue 4: Auditor General, functions and powers—(not reported).

Issues 6 and 7: Public Accounts for 1970-71 and the Auditor General's Report thereon—(not reported).

Transport and Communications Committee:

Issue 1: Organization meeting and Post Office, main estimates for 1972-73—(deemed reported).

THE MINISTRY
OF THE RIGHT HON. PIERRE E. TRUDEAU
(according to precedence)
and
PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Ministers and their Portfolios		Parliamentary Secretaries
Rt. Hon. Pierre E. Trudeau	Prime Minister of Canada	Mr. B. J. Danson
Hon. Paul J. J. Martin	Leader of the Government in the Senate	
Hon. Mitchell Sharp	Secretary of State for External Affairs	Mr. G. J. Isabelle Mr. Paul St. Pierre Mr. C. Lloyd Francis
Hon. Arthur Laing	Minister of Veterans Affairs	
Hon. Allan J. MacEachen	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada	Mr. J. A. Jerome
Hon. Charles M. Drury	President of the Treasury Board	Mr. Gaston Clermont
Hon. Edgar J. Benson	Minister of National Defence	Mr. J. Roland Comtois
Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin	Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce	Mr. B. A. T. Howard
Hon. Jean Marchand	Minister of Regional Economic Expansion	Mr. John Roberts
Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté	Postmaster General	Mr. Gerald Cobbe
Hon. John N. Turner	Minister of Finance	Mr. J. J. Buchanan
Hon. Jean Chrétien	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Mr. Allen Sulatycky
Hon. Bryce Mackasey	Minister of Manpower and Immigration	Mr. R. J. Perrault
Hon. Donald S. Macdonald	Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources	Mr. J. G. S. Cullen
Hon. John C. Munro	Minister of National Health and Welfare	Mr. A. Ouellet
Hon. Gérard Pelletier	Secretary of State of Canada	Mr. J. H. Faulkner Mr. Marcel Prud'homme Mr. E. G. Corbin
Hon. Jack Davis	Minister of Environment and Minister of Fisheries	
Hon. Horace A. Olson	Minister of Agriculture	Mr. Marcel Lessard
Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé	Minister of Public Works	Mr. G. Blouin
Hon. Ronald Basford	Minister of State for Urban Affairs	Mr. D. B. Weatherhead
Hon. Donald Campbell Jamieson . .	Minister of Transport	Mr. G. Duquet
Hon. Robert K. Andras	Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs	Mr. Donald R. Tolmie
Hon. James A. Richardson	Minister of Supply and Services and Receiver General	Mr. Steven Otto
Hon. Otto E. Lang	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Mr. A. Béchard
Hon. Herbert E. Gray	Minister of National Revenue	Mr. Ian Watson

Ministers and their Portfolios

Parliamentary Secretaries

Hon. Robert D. G. Stanbury Minister of Communications

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer Solicitor General of Canada

Mr. D. A. Hogarth

Hon. Alastair W. Gillespie Minister of State for Science and
Technology

Hon. Martin P. O'Connell Minister of Labour

Hon. Patrick M. Mahoney Minister of State

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker	The Honourable Lucien Lamoureux
Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole House	Russell Honey, Esq.
Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House	Gérald Laniel, Esq.
Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House	Prosper Boulanger, Esq.

Clerk of the House	Alistair Fraser, B.A., LL.B
Clerk Assistant	J. Gordon Dubroy
Clerk Assistant (Legal)	Marcel R. Pelletier, B.A., B.Ph., LL.L, D.G.S.L.
Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel	J. P. J. Maingot, B.Comm., LL.B
Second Clerk Assistant	Alexander Small
Third Clerk Assistant	
Sergeant-at-Arms	Lieutenant-Colonel David V. Currie, V.C.
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms	J. L. Lacroix

ALPHABETICAL LIST
OF THE
MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Fourth Session, Twenty-Eighth Parliament

A

Aiken, Gordon Harvey—Parry Sound-Muskoka.
Alexander, Lincoln—Hamilton West.
Alkenbrack, A. Douglas—Frontenac-Lennox and
Addington.
Allmand, Warren—Notre Dame de Grâce.
Anderson, David¹—Esquimalt-Saanich.
Andras, Hon. Robert K.—Port Arthur.
Asselin, Hon. Martial—Charlevoix.

B

Badanai, Hubert—Fort William.
Baldwin, Gerald W.—Peace River.
Barnett, Thomas Speakman—Comox-Alberni.
Barrett, H. Gordon—Lincoln.
Basford, Hon. Ronald—Vancouver Centre.
Beaudoin, Léonel—Richmond.
Béchar, Albert—Bonaventure-Iles de la Madeleine.
Beer, Bruce S.—Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe.
Bell, Thomas M.—Saint John-Lancaster.
Benjamin, L. G. (Les)—Regina-Lake Centre.
Benson, Hon. Edgar J.—Kingston and the Islands.
Bigg, Jack—Pembina.
Blackburn, Derek—Brant.
Blair, D. Gordon—Grenville-Carleton.
Blouin, Gustave—Manicouagan.
Borrie, Robert—Prince George—Peace River.
Boulanger, Prosper—Mercier.
Breau, Herbert—Gloucester.
Brewin, F. Andrew—Greenwood.
Broadbent, J. Edward—Oshawa-Whitby.
Buchanan, J. Judd—London West.
Burton, John—Regina East.

C

Caccia, Charles L.—Davenport.
Cadieu, Albert C.—Meadow Lake.
Cafik, Norman A.—Ontario.
Cantin, Jean-Charles—Louis Hébert.
Caouette, Réal—Témiscamingue.
Carter, Walter C.—St. John's West.

Chappell, H. G.—Peel South.
Chrétien, Hon. Jean—St. Maurice.
Clermont, Gaston—Gatineau.
Coates, Robert C.—Cumberland-Colchester North.
Cobbe, Gerald R.—Portage.
Code, Desmond—Leeds.
Comeau, Louis R.—South Western Nova.
Comtois, J. Roland—Terrebonne.
Corbin, Eymard—Madawaska-Victoria.
Corriveau, Leopold—Frontenac.
Côté, Florian—Richelieu.
Côté, Hon. Jean-Pierre—Longueuil.
Crossman, Guy—Westmorland-Kent.
Crouse, Lloyd R.—South Shore.
Cullen, Jack—Sarnia-Lambton.
Cyr, Alexandre—Gaspé.

D

Danforth, Harold W.—Kent-Essex.
Danson, Barnett, J.—York North.
Davis, Hon. Jack—Capilano.
Deachman, Grant—Vancouver Quadra.
Deakon, Walter—High Park-Humber Valley.
De Bané, Pierre—Matane.
Diefenbaker, Right Hon. John George—Prince Albert.
Dinsdale, Hon. Walter G.—Brandon-Souris.
Dionne, Charles-Eugène—Kamouraska.
Douglas, T. C.—Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.
Downey, Cliff—Battle River.
Drury, Hon. Charles M.—Westmount.
Dubé, Hon. Jean-Eudes—Restigouche.
Dupras, Maurice—Labelle.
Duquet, Gérard—Quebec East.

E

Emard, René—Vaudreuil.
Ethier, Viateur—Glengarry-Prescott-Russell.

F

Fairweather, R. Gordon L.—Fundy-Royal.
Faulkner, J. Hugh—Peterborough.

¹Resigned, July 24, 1972.

Flemming, Hon. Hugh John—Carleton-Charlotte.
 Forest, Yves—Brome-Missisquoi.
 Forget, Victor—St. Michel.
 Forrestall, J. Michael—Dartmouth-Halifax East.
 Fortin, André—Lotbinière.
 Foster, Maurice—Algoma.
 Francis, Lloyd—Ottawa West.

G

Gauthier, Charles-Arthur—Roberval.
 Gendron, Rosaire—Rivière du Loup-Témiscouata.
 Gervais, Paul M.—Sherbrooke.
 Gibson, Colin D.—Hamilton-Wentworth.
 Gilbert, John—Broadview.
 Gillespie, Hon. Alastair W.—Etobicoke.
 Gleave, A. P.—Saskatoon-Biggar.
 Godin, Roland—Portneuf.
 Goode, Tom H.—Burnaby-Richmond-Delta.
 Goyer, Hon. Jean-Pierre—Dollard.
 Gray, Hon. Herbert E.—Windsor West.
 Greene, Hon. John James—Niagara Falls.
 Grills, Lee—Hastings.
 Groos, David W.—Victoria.
 Guay, Joseph P.—St. Boniface.
 Guay, Raynald—Lévis.
 Guilbault, Jacques—St. Jacques.
 Gundlock, Deane R.—Lethbridge.

H

Haidasz, Stanley—Parkdale.
 Hales, Alfred D.—Wellington.
 Harding, Randolph—Kootenay West.
 Harkness, Hon. Douglas S.—Calgary Centre.
 Harries, H.—Edmonton-Strathcona.
 Hees, Hon. George—Prince Edward-Hastings.
 Hellyer, Hon. Paul T.—Trinity.
 Hogarth, Douglas A.—New Westminster.
 Honey, Russell C.—Northumberland-Durham.
 Hopkins, Leonard Donald—Renfrew North-Nipissing East.
 Horner, Jack H.—Crowfoot.
 Howard, Bruce—Okanagan Boundary.
 Howard, Frank—Skeena.
 Howe, W. Marvin—Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo.
 Hymmen, Kieth R.—Kitchener.

I

Isabelle, Gaston—Hull.

J

Jamieson, Hon. Donald Campbell—Burin-Burgeo.
 Jerome, J. A.—Sudbury.

K

Kaplan, Robert—Don Valley.
 Kierans, Hon. Eric—Duvernay.
 Knight, William—Assiniboia.
 Knowles, Stanley H.—Winnipeg North Centre.
 Knowles, William D.—Norfolk-Haldimand.
 Korchinski, Stanley J.—Mackenzie.

L

Lachance, Georges C.—Lafontaine.
 Laflamme, Ovide—Montmorency.
 Laing, Hon. Arthur—Vancouver South.
 Lajoie, Claude G.—Metropolitan Trois-Rivières.
 Lambert, Adrien—Bellechasse.
 Lambert, Hon. Marcel—Edmonton West.
 Lamoureux, Hon. Lucien—Stormont-Dundas.
 Lang, Hon. Otto E.—Saskatoon-Humboldt.
 Langlois, Paul—Chicoutimi.
 Laniel, Gérald—Beauharnois-Salaberry.
 Laprise, Gérard—Abitibi.
 La Salle, Roch—Joliette.
 Latulippe, Henry P.—Compton.
 Leblanc, Fernand E.—Laurier.
 LeBlanc, Guy—Rimouski.
 Lefebvre, Thomas—Pontiac.
 Legault, Carl—Nipissing.
 Lessard, H. Pit—LaSalle.
 Lessard, Marcel—Lac Saint Jean.
 Lewis, David—York South.
 L'Heureux, Yvon—Chambly.
 Lind, James G.—Middlesex.
 Loiselle, Gérard—St. Henri.
 Lundrigan, John—Gander-Twillingate.

M

MacDonald, David—Egmont.
 Macdonald, Hon. Donald S.—Rosedale.
 MacEachen, Hon. Allan J.—Cape Breton Highlands-Canso.
 MacGuigan, Mark—Windsor-Walkerville.
 MacInnis, Donald—Cape Breton-East Richmond.
 MacInnis, Mrs. Grace—Vancouver Kingsway.
 Mackasey, Hon. Bryce Stuart—Verdun.

MacKay, Elmer M.—Central Nova.
 MacLean, Hon. J. Angus—Malpeque.
 Macquarrie, Heath—Hillsborough.
 MacRae, J. Chester—York-Sunbury.
 Mahoney, Hon. Patrick M.—Calgary South.
 Major, Robert Benoit—Argenteuil-Deux Montagnes.
 Marceau, Gilles—Lapointe.
 Marchand, Hon. Jean—Langelier.
 Marchand, Leonard Stephen (Len)—Kamloops-Cariboo.
 Marshall, Jack—Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe.
 Mather, Barry—Surrey-White Rock.
 Matte, René—Champlain.
 Mazankowski, Don—Vegreville.
 McBride, Murray A.—Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton.
 McCleave, Robert—Halifax, East Hants.
 McCutcheon, Mac T.—Lambton-Kent.
 McGrath, James A.—St. John's East.
 McIlraith, Hon. George J.²—Ottawa Centre.
 McIntosh, Jack—Swift Current-Maple Creek.
 McKinley, Robert E.—Huron.
 McNulty, James C.—St. Catharines.
 McQuaid, Melvin—Cardigan.
 Monteith, Hon. J. Waldo—Perth-Wilmot.
 Moore, Harry A.—Wetaskiwin.
 Morison, John B.—Halton-Wentworth.
 Muir, Robert—Cape Breton-The Sydneys.
 Munro, Hon. John C.—Hamilton East.
 Murphy, C. Terrence—Sault Ste. Marie.
 Murta, Jack—Lisgar.

N

Nesbitt, Wallace B.—Oxford.
 Nielsen, Erik—Yukon.
 Noble, Percy V.—Grey-Simcoe.
 Noël, Aurélien—Outremont.
 Nowlan, J. Patrick—Annapolis Valley.
 Nystrom, Lorne—Yorkton-Melville.

O

O'Connell, Hon. Martin—Scarborough East.
 Olson, Hon. Horace A.—Medicine Hat.
 Orange, Robert—Northwest Territories.
 Orlikow, David—Winnipeg North.
 Osler, E. B.—Winnipeg South Centre.
 Otto, Steven—York East.
 Ouellet, André—Papineau.

P

Paproski, Steven—Edmonton Centre.
 Peddle, Ambrose—Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador.
 Pelletier, Hon. Gérard—Hochelaga.
 Penner, B. Keith—Thunder Bay.
 Pepin, Hon. Jean-Luc—Drummond.
 Perrault, R. J. (Ray)—Burnaby-Seymour.
 Peters, Arnold—Timiskaming.
 Portelance, Arthur—Gamelin.
 Pringle (Jerry) M. E.—Fraser Valley East.
 Prud'homme, Marcel—St. Denis.

R

Reid, John M.—Kenora-Rainy River.
 Ricard, Hon. Théogène—St. Hyacinthe.
 Richard, Jean-T.—Ottawa East.
 Richardson, Hon. James A.—Winnipeg South.
 Ritchie, Gordon—Dauphin.
 Roberts, John—York-Simcoe.
 Robinson, William Kenneth—Toronto-Lakeshore.
 Rochon, Jean-L.—Ahuntsic.
 Rock, Raymond—Lachine.
 Rodrigue, Romuald—Beauce.
 Rondeau, Gilbert—Shefford.
 Rose, Mark W.—Fraser Valley West.
 Rowland, Douglas—Selkirk.
 Roy, Jean-R.—Timmins.
 Roy, Marcel—Laval.
 Ryan, S. Perry—Spadina.
 Rynard, Philip Bernard—Simcoe North.

S

St. Pierre, Paul—Coast Chilcotin.
 Saltsman, Max—Waterloo.
 Schumacher, Stan—Palliser.
 Scott, William C.—Victoria-Haliburton.
 Serré, Gaétan—Nickel Belt.
 Sharp, Hon. Mitchell—Eglinton.
 Simpson, Robert—Churchill.
 Skoberg, John L.—Moose Jaw.
 Skoreyko, William—Edmonton East.
 Smerchanski, Mark G.—Provencher.
 Smith, G. A. Percy—Northumberland-Miramichi.
 Smith, Walter—St. Jean.
 Southam, Richard R.—Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain.
 Stafford, Harold E.—Elgin.
 Stanbury, Hon. Robert—York Scarborough.

²Summoned to the Senate, Apr. 27, 1972.

Stanfield, Hon. Robert L.—Halifax.
Stewart, Craig—Marquette.
Stewart, Ralph—Cochrane.
Stewart, William Douglas—Okanagan-Kootenay.
Sulatycky, Allen—Rocky Mountain.
Sullivan, Gordon—Hamilton Mountain.

T

Tétrault, Oza—Villeneuve.
Thomas, J.—Antonio—Maisonneuve-Rosemont.
Thomas, Charles—Moncton.
Thompson, Robert N.—Red Deer.
Thomson, Rod—Battleford-Kindersley.
Tolmie, Donald R.—Welland.
Trudeau, Right Hon. Pierre Elliott—Mount Royal.
Trudel, Jacques L.—Montreal-Bourassa.
Turner, Charles—London East.
Turner, Hon. John N.—Ottawa-Carleton.

V

Valade, Georges-J.—Ste. Marie.

W

Wahn, Ian G.—St. Paul's.
Walker, James E.—York Centre.
Watson, Ian—Laprairie.
Weatherhead, David—Scarborough West.
Whelan, Eugene F.—Essex-Windsor.
Whicher, Ross M.—Bruce.
Whiting, R. L.—Halton.
Winch, Harold E.—Vancouver East.
Woolliams, Eldon M.—Calgary North.

Y

Yanakis, Antonio—Berthier.
Yewchuk, Paul—Athabasca.

ALPHABETICAL LIST
OF THE
CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Fourth Session, Twenty-eighth Parliament

A

Abitibi—Laprise, Gérard.
Ahuntsic—Rochon, Jean-L.
Algoma—Foster, Maurice.
Annapolis Valley—Nowlan, J. Patrick.
Argenteuil-Deux Montagnes—Major, Robert Benoit.
Assiniboia—Knight, William.
Athabasca—Yewchuk, Paul.

B

Battle River—Downey, Cliff.
Battledford—Kindersley—Thomson, Rod.
Beauce—Rodrigue, Romuald.
Beauharnois—Salaberry—Laniel, Gérard.
Bellechasse—Lambert, Adrien.
Berthier—Yanakis, Antonio.
Bonaventure—Iles de la Madeleine—Béchar, Albert.
Bonaville—Trinity—Conception—
Brandon—Souris—Dinsdale, Hon. Walter G.
Brant—Blackburn, Derek.
Broadview—Gilbert, John.
Brome-Missisquoi—Forest, Yves.
Bruce—Whicher, Ross M.
Burin—Burge—Jamieson, Hon. Donald Campbell.
Burnaby—Richmond—Delta—Goode, Tom H.
Burnaby—Seymour—Perrault, R. J. (Ray).

C

Calgary Centre—Harkness, Hon. Douglas S.
Calgary North—Woolliams, Eldon M.
Calgary South—Mahoney, Hon. Patrick M.
Cape Breton—East Richmond—MacInnis, Donald.
Cape Breton Highlands—Canso—MacEachen, Hon. Allan J.
Cape Breton—The Sydneys—Muir, Robert.
Capilano—Davis, Hon. Jack.
Cardigan—McQuaid, Melvin.
Carleton—Charlotte—Flemming, Hon. Hugh John.
Central Nova—MacKay, Elmer M.
Chambly—L'Heureux, Yvon.
Champlain—Matte, René.

Charlevoix—Asselin, Hon. Martial.
Chicoutimi—Langlois, Paul.
Churchill—Simpson, Robert.
Coast Chilcotin—St. Pierre, Paul.
Cochrane—Stewart, Ralph.
Comox-Alberni—Barnett, Thomas Speakman.
Compton—Latulippe, Henry P.
Crowfoot—Horner, Jack H.
Cumberland-Colchester North—Coates, Robert C.

D

Dartmouth—Halifax East—Forrestall, J. Michael.
Dauphin—Ritchie, Gordon.
Davenport—Caccia, Charles L.
Dollard—Goyer, Hon. Jean-Pierre.
Don Valley—Kaplan, Robert.
Drummond—Pepin, Hon. Jean-Luc.
Duvernay—Kierans, Hon. Eric.

E

Edmonton Centre—Paproski, Steven.
Edmonton East—Skoreyko, William.
Edmonton—Strathcona—Harries, H.
Edmonton West—Lambert, Hon. Marcel.
Eglinton—Sharp, Hon. Mitchell.
Egmont—MacDonald, David.
Elgin—Stafford, Harold E.
Esquimalt—Saanich—Anderson, David¹.
Essex—Windsor—Whelan, Eugene F.
Etobicoke—Gillespie, Hon. Alastair W.

F

Fort William—Badanai, Hubert.
Fraser Valley East—Pringle, (Jerry) M. E.
Fraser Valley West—Rose, Mark W.
Frontenac—Corriveau, Leopold.
Frontenac—Lennox and Addington—Alkenbrack, A. Douglas.
Fundy—Royal—Fairweather, R. Gordon L.

¹Resigned, July 24, 1972.

G

Gamelin—Portelance, Arthur.
 Gander—Twillingate—Lundrigan, John.
 Gaspé—Cyr, Alexandre.
 Gatineau—Clermont, Gaston.
 Glengarry—Prescott—Russell—Ethier, Viateur.
 Gloucester—Breau, Herbert.
 Grand Falls—White Bay—Labrador—Peddle, Ambrose.
 Greenwood—Brewin, F. Andrew.
 Grenville—Carleton—Blair, D. Gordon.
 Grey—Simcoe—Noble, Percy V.

H

Halifax—Stanfield, Hon. Robert L.
 Halifax—East Hants—McCleave, Robert.
 Halton—Whiting, R. L.
 Halton—Wentworth—Morison, John B.
 Hamilton East—Munro, Hon. John C.
 Hamilton Mountain—Sullivan, Gordon.
 Hamilton—Wentworth—Gibson, Colin D.
 Hamilton West—Alexander, Lincoln.
 Hastings—Grills, Lee.
 High Park—Humber Valley—Deakon, Walter C.
 Hillsborough—Macquarrie, Heath.
 Hochelaga—Pelletier, Hon. Gérard.
 Hull—Isabelle, Gaston.
 Humber—St. George's—St. Barbe—Marshall, Jack.
 Huron—McKinley, Robert E.

J

Joliette—La Salle, Roch.

K

Kamloops—Cariboo—Marchand, Leonard Stephen (Len).
 Kamouraska—Dionne, Charles-Eugène.
 Kenora—Rainy River—Reid, John M.
 Kent—Essex—Danforth, Harold W.
 Kingston and the Islands—Benson, Hon. Edgar J.
 Kitchener—Hymmen, Kieth R.
 Kootenay West—Harding, Randolph.

L

Labelle—Dupras, Maurice.
 Lachine—Rock, Raymond.

Lac Saint Jean—Lessard, Marcel.
 Lafontaine—Lachance, Georges C.
 Lambton—Kent—McCutcheon, Mac T.
 Lanark—Renfrew—Carleton—McBride, Murray A.
 Langelier—Marchand, Hon. Jean.
 Lapointe—Marceau, Gilles.
 Laprairie—Watson, Ian.
 LaSalle—Lessard, H. Pit.
 Laurier—Leblanc, Fernand E.
 Laval—Roy, Marcel.
 Leeds—Code, Desmond.
 Lethbridge—Gundlock, Deane R.
 Lévis—Guay, Raynald.
 Lincoln—Barrett, H. Gordon.
 Lisgar—Murta, Jack.
 London East—Turner, Charles.
 London West—Buchanan, J. Judd.
 Longueuil—Côté, Hon. Jean-Pierre.
 Lotbinière—Fortin, André.
 Louis—Hébert—Cantin, Jean-Charles.

M

Mackenzie—Korchinski, Stanley J.
 Madawaska—Victoria—Corbin, Eymard.
 Maisonneuve—Rosemont—Thomas, J.-Antonio.
 Malpeque—MacLean, Hon. J. Angus.
 Manicouagan—Blouin, Gustave.
 Matane—De Bané, Pierre.
 Marquette—Stewart, Craig.
 Meadow Lake—Cadieu, Albert C.
 Medicine Hat—Olson, Hon. Horace A.
 Mercier—Boulanger, Prosper.
 Metropolitan Trois-Rivières—Lajoie, Claude G.
 Middlesex—Lind, James G.
 Moncton—Thomas, Charles.
 Montmorency—Laflamme, Ovide.
 Montreal—Bourassa—Trudel, Jacques L.
 Moose Jaw—Skoberg, John L.
 Mount Royal—Trudeau, Right Hon. Pierre Elliott.

N

Nanaimo—Cowichan—The Islands—Douglas, T. C.
 New Westminster—Hogarth, Douglas A.
 Niagara Falls—Greene, Hon. John James.
 Nickel Belt—Serré, Gaétan.
 Nipissing—Legault, Carl.
 Norfolk—Haldimand—Knowles, William D.
 Northumberland—Durham—Honey, Russell C.
 Northumberland—Miramichi—Smith, G. A. Percy.
 Northwest Territories—Orange, Robert.
 Notre Dame de Grâce—Allmand, Warren.

O

Okanagan Boundary—Howard, Bruce.
 Okanagan-Kootenay—Stewart, William Douglas.
 Ontario—Cafik, Norman A.
 Oshawa-Whitby—Broadbent, J. Edward.
 Ottawa-Carleton—Turner, Hon. John N.
 Ottawa Centre—McIlraith, Hon. George J.²
 Ottawa East—Richard, Jean-T.
 Ottawa West—Francis, Lloyd.
 Outremont—Noël, Aurélien.
 Oxford—Nesbitt, Wallace B.

P

Palliser—Schumacher, Stan.
 Papineau—Ouellet, André.
 Parkdale—Haidasz, Stanley.
 Parry Sound-Muskoka—Aiken, Gordon Harvey.
 Peace River—Baldwin, Gerald W.
 Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe—Beer, Bruce S.
 Peel South—Chappell, H. G.
 Pembina—Bigg, F. Jack.
 Perth-Wilmot—Monteith, Hon. J. Waldo.
 Peterborough—Faulkner, Hugh.
 Pontiac—Lefebvre, Thomas.
 Port Arthur—Andras, Hon. Robert K.
 Portage—Cobbe, Gerald R.
 Portneuf—Godin, Roland.
 Prince Albert—Diefenbaker, Right Hon. John George.
 Prince Edward-Hastings—Hees, Hon. George.
 Prince George-Peace River—Borrie, Robert.
 Provencher—Smerchanski, Mark G.

Q

Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain—Southam, Richard R.
 Quebec East—Duquet, Gérard.

R

Red Deer—Thompson, Robert N.
 Regina East—Burton, John.
 Regina-Lake Centre—Benjamin, L. G. (Les).
 Renfrew North-Nipissing East—Hopkins, Leonard Donald.
 Restigouche—Dubé, Hon. Jean-Eudes.
 Richelieu-Côté, Florian.

Richmond—Beaudoin, Léonel.
 Rimouski—LeBlanc, Guy.
 Rivière du Loup-Témiscouata—Gendron, Rosaire.
 Roberval—Gauthier, Charles-Arthur.
 Rocky Mountain—Sulatycky, Allen.
 Rosedale—Macdonald, Hon. Donald S.

S

St. Boniface—Guay, Joseph P.
 St. Catherines—McNulty, James C.
 St. Denis—Prud'homme, Marcel.
 St. Henri—Loiselle, Gérard.
 St. Hyacinthe—Ricard, Hon. Théogène.
 St. Jacques—Guilbault, Jacques.
 St. Jean—Smith, Walter.
 St. John-Lancaster—Bell, Thomas M.
 St. John's East—McGrath, James A.
 St. John's West—Carter, Walter C.
 Ste. Marie—Valade, Georges-J.
 St. Maurice—Chrétien, Hon. Jean.
 St. Michel—Forget, Victor.
 St. Paul's—Wahn, Ian G.
 Sarnia-Lambton—Cullen, Jack.
 Saskatoon-Biggar—Gleave, A. P.
 Saskatoon-Humboldt—Lang, Hon. Otto E.
 Sault Ste. Marie—Murphy, C. Terrence.
 Scarborough East—O'Connell, Hon. Martin.
 Scarborough West—Weatherhead, David.
 Selkirk—Rowland, Douglas.
 Shefford—Rondeau, Gilbert.
 Sherbrooke—Gervais, Paul M.
 Simcoe North—Rynard, Philip Bernard.
 Skeena—Howard, Frank.
 South Shore—Crouse, Lloyd R.
 South Western Nova—Comeau, Louis R.
 Spadina—Ryan, S. Perry.
 Stormont-Dundas—Lamoureux, Hon. Lucien.
 Sudbury—Jerome, J. A.
 Surrey-White Rock—Mather, Barry.
 Swift Current-Maple Creek—McIntosh, Jack.

T

Témiscamingue—Caouette, Réal.
 Terrebonne—Comtois, J. Roland.
 Thunder Bay—Penner, B. Keith.
 Timiskaming—Peters, Arnold.
 Timmins—Roy, Jean-R.
 Toronto-Lakeshore—Robinson, William Kenneth.
 Trinity-Hellyer, Hon. Paul T.

²Summioned to the Senate, Apr. 27, 1972.

V

Vancouver Centre—Bastford, Hon. Ronald.
Vancouver East—Winch, Harold E.
Vancouver Kingsway—MacInnis, Mrs. Grace.
Vancouver Quadra—Deachman, Grant.
Vancouver South—Laing, Hon. Arthur.
Vaudreuil—Emard, René.
Vegreville—Mazankowski, Don.
Verdun—Mackasey, Hon. Bryce Stuart.
Victoria—Groos, David W.
Victoria—Haliburton—Scott, William C.
Villeneuve—Tétrault, Oza.

W

Waterloo—Saltsman, Max.
Welland—Tolmie, Donald R.
Wellington—Hales, Alfred D.
Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Waterloo—Howe, W. Marvin.
Westmorland—Kent—Crossman, Guy.

Westmount—Drury, Hon. Charles M.
Wetaskiwin—Moore, Harry A.
Windsor—Walkerville—MacGuigan, Mark.
Windsor West—Gray, Hon. Herbert E.
Winnipeg North—Orlikow, David.
Winnipeg North Centre—Knowles, Stanley H.
Winnipeg South—Richardson, Hon. James A.
Winnipeg South Centre—Osler, E. B.

Y

York Centre—Walker, James E.
York East—Otto, Steven.
York North—Danson, Barnett J.
York—Scarborough—Stanbury, Hon. Robert.
York—Simcoe—Roberts, John.
York South—Lewis, David.
York—Sunbury—MacRae, J. Chester.
York West—
Yorkton—Melville—Nystrom, Lorne.
Yukon—Nielsen, Erik.

INDEX
TO THE
JOURNALS
OF THE
HOUSE OF COMMONS
OF CANADA

From Thursday, February 17, 1972 to
Friday, September 1, 1972 inclusive,
in the
Twenty-First Year of the Reign of
OUR SOVEREIGN LADY,
QUEEN ELIZABETH THE SECOND

1972
Fourth Session, Twenty-Eighth Parliament

A

Abortion:

See **Criminal Code amendment.**

Address in Reply, Debate on:

Speech reported by Mr. Speaker, 1. Motion (Mr. Trudeau),—To give consideration to Speech later this day, moved, 5. Amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre),—Immediately after an oral question period, ruled out of order, 5-6. Main motion agreed to, on division, 6. Address in Reply moved and debate adjourned, 7. Debate resumed (1st appointed day); amendment (Mr. Stanfield),—Failure to provide an economic climate in which Canadians can have confidence; subamendment (Mr. Lewis),—Failure to relieve serious unemployment situation: moved and debate adjourned, 9-10. Debate resumed (2nd appointed day), 12-3; subamendment negatived on recorded division, 13-4. Debate resumed (3rd appointed day), 15-6; subamendment (Mr. Caouette),—Failure to proceed with monetary reform: moved and debate interrupted, 16. Debate resumed (4th appointed day), 17; subamendment negatived on recorded division, 18-9; amendment negatived on recorded division, 19. Debate resumed (5th appointed day); amendment (Mr. Alexander),—Failure to achieve full employment: moved and debate interrupted, 21-2. Debate resumed (6th appointed day) and interrupted, 26-7. Debate resumed (7th appointed day), 31; amendment negatived on recorded division, 31-2. Debate resumed (8th appointed day); main motion agreed to, on division, 33-4. Motion for engrossing and presenting to Governor General, 34.

Address to the Queen:

See **British North America Act amendment.**

Adjournment to Discuss Matter of Urgent Public Importance:

By Mr. Aiken: Power, James Bay hydro-electric development, effect on Indians and environment: stood over until next sitting, 261. Moved,—That the House do now adjourn, after debate, motion agreed to, 265.

Adjournments, Special:

1. Motion,—That when House adjourns Wednesday, Mar. 29, 1972, it shall stand adjourned until Thursday, Apr. 13, 1972 (Easter recess), subject to recall earlier by Mr. Speaker or Mr. Deputy Speaker, agreed to after debate, 227.
2. Motion,—That when House adjourns following passing of Bills C-170 and C-230 or, at ordinary adjournment hour on Friday, July 7, 1972, it shall stand adjourned until Sept. 28, 1972 (summer recess), subject to recall earlier by Mr. Speaker or Mr. Deputy Speaker; amendment (Mr. MacEachen),—To substitute "provided that Royal Assent has been given to Bill C-230", moved and agreed to, 503. Main motion agreed to, 504.

Administrative Review Board Act:

Bill C-226, Mr. Rose. 1st R, 447.

Adult Occupational Training:

See **Family Allowances.**

Adult Occupational Training Act:

Order,—Return re contracts in 1971-72 between Manpower and Immigration Minister and contractors in Quebec pursuant to Section 6 of said Act: Mr. Godin—presented forthwith, 396-7. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/573.

Adult Occupational Training Act amendment:

1. Bill C-96, Mrs. MacInnis. 1st R, 25.
2. Bill C-195, Minister of Manpower and Immigration—To adjust eligibility requirements and provide for contracts with employers. 1st R, 257. 2nd R after debate, referred to Labour, Manpower and Immigration Committee, 278. Reported without amendment, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 26 to *Journals*, 351. Report stage; motion to amend, agreed to, 423-4. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 424. 3rd R agreed to, 424. Passed by Senate, 491. R.A., 492. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 14, S.C. 1972.

Advertising:

Order,—Return re cost for "Assured Mail" program, Canada Savings Bonds and new design of Canada cheques: Mr. Gleave—presented forthwith, 208. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/202.

See also **Broadcasting Act amendment; Food and Drugs Act amendment.**

Agreements, Protocols, Exchange of Notes, Treaties, etc.:**1. Air transport:**

(a) Convention re unlawful acts against safety of civil aviation done at Montreal, Sept. 23, 1971, 421. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/50.

(b) Convention re unlawful seizure of aircraft signed at the Hague, Dec. 16, 1970, 421. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/51.

2. Atomic energy: Treaty on prohibition of emplacement on nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction on the ocean floor, 311-2. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/37A.**3. Fisheries:**

(a) Agreement with Denmark, 227. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/100.

(b) Agreement with France, 227. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/107.

(c) Agreement with United Kingdom, 227. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/111.

(d) Agreement with Portugal, 227. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/109.

4. Social security: Convention, with final protocol, with Federal Republic of Germany, 251. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/88.**5. Space Technology: Memorandum of understanding between Communications Department and European Space Research Organization, 312. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/37.****Agricultural Products:**

Order,—Return re exports and imports of certain products between 1967 and 1971, monies received and spent: Mr. Yewchuk—presented forthwith, 487. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/535.

Agricultural Products Board:

Report for 1971-72, 445. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/51.

Agricultural Stabilization Board:

Report for 1971-72, 445. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/52.

Agriculture:

Order,—Return re training courses under auspices of Canada Manpower Training Program, duration, participation, etc.: Mr. Mazankowski—presented forthwith, 442. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/551.

Agriculture Committee:

1. Membership, 37, 48, 52, 60, 63, 66, 204, 206, 209, 214, 225, 228, 238, 248, 256, 264, 270, 272, 276, 280, 282, 291, 302, 312, 320, 334, 342, 350, 355, 359, 373, 380, 392, 419, 438.

2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Agriculture Department, Canadian Dairy Commission, Canadian Livestock Feed Board, Farm Credit Corporation, 29.

3. Bills referred: Farm Credit Act amendment, 287.

4. Reports referred: Canadian Wheat Board supplementary reports for 1968-69, 1969-70 and annual report for 1970-71, 401.

5. Reports: First (Agriculture, Canadian Dairy Commission, Canadian Livestock Feed Board, Farm Credit Corporation, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 21 to *Journals*), 331; Second (Farm Credit Act amendment) (Appendix 33 to *Journals*), 421.

Agriculture Department:

1. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Agriculture Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 21 to *Journals*, 331.

2. Order,—Report on United States Internal Food-Aid Program and its application to Canada: Mrs. MacInnis; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 49. Moved and debate interrupted, 504.

3. Order,—Return re Contagious Diseases Division, offices in Quebec, jurisdiction, qualifications of officers applying regulations: Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse)—presented forthwith, 428. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/618.

Air Canada:

1. Report for 1971, 239. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/54.
 2. Report of auditors for 1971, 239. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/55.
 3. Order,—Papers and studies re consolidation of reservation offices: Mr. Orlikow; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 382-3.
- See also **Canadian National Railways Financing and Guarantee Act**.

Air Transport:

See **Agreements, Protocols, Exchange of Notes, Treaties, etc.**

Airports:

1. Letters dated Mar. 1, 1972 re establishment of an airport in Pickering Township, with "Annex of Understanding", 39. Sess. Paper No. 284-5/135.
 2. Address,—Correspondence, etc. with Ontario government re second international airport for the province: Mr. Howe, 51. Presented, 313. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/51.
 3. Address,—Correspondence, etc. re sale of land at Regina Airport to Transport Department: Mr. Burton, 327. Presented, 334. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/18.
- See also **Vancouver International Airport Act**.

Alaska-Yukon Highway Authority Act:

Bill C-70, Mr. Thompson (Red Deer) (Alaska Highway). 1st R, 25.

Amendments:**Address Debate:**

- Amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre) to motion to consider the Throne Speech later this day, ruled out of order, 5-6.
- Amendment (1st and 4th appointed days) by Mr. Stanfield (Opposition Leader) to add: Failure to provide an economic climate in which Canadians can have confidence, moved, 9; negatived on recorded division, 19.
- Amendment (5th and 7th appointed days) by Mr. Alexander to add: Failure to achieve full employment, moved, 21; negatived on recorded division, 31-2.
- Subamendment (1st and 2nd appointed days) by Mr. Lewis to add: Failure to relieve serious unemployment situation, moved, 10; negatived on recorded division, 13-4.
- Subamendment (3rd and 4th appointed days) by Mr. Caouette to add: Failure to proceed with monetary reform, moved, 16; negatived on recorded division, 18-9.

Adjournments:

- Amendment to substitute "provided that Royal Assent has been given to Bill C-230" in motion for summer recess, agreed to, 503.

Bills, Government; Second Reading:

- Explosives Act amendment (Bill C-7): To decline second reading, affirm a certain principle and refer the subject-matter to Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, ruled out of order, 208.
- Canadian National Railways Financing and Guarantee Act (Bill C-4): To supersede second reading by "six months' hoist", moved and debate interrupted, 62. Debate resumed and interrupted, 249.
- Family Income Security Plan Act (Bill C-170): To defer second reading and increase allowances through other legislation, moved and debate interrupted, 246. Debate resumed and interrupted, 247-8, 255-6, 258. Debate resumed, amendment negatived on recorded division, 261-2.
- Farm Credit Act amendment (Bill C-5): To decline second reading and consider legislation incorporating the incentive principle regarding interest rates, moved and debate interrupted, 272. Debate resumed and interrupted, 275-6. Debate resumed and adjourned, 280, 281-2. Debate resumed, negatived on recorded division, 286.
- Farm Credit Act amendment (Bill C-5): Subamendment to delete certain words and add others, moved and debate interrupted, 276. Debate resumed and adjourned, 280, 281-2. Debate resumed, negatived on recorded division, 285.
- Old Age Security Act amendment (Bill C-207): To decline second reading and consider certain changes, 287-8, ruled out of order, 293-4.

*Amendments - (Continued)**Bills, Government; Second Reading - (Concluded)*

- Election Expenses Act (Bill C-211): To decline second reading and introduce legislation to provide effective control of election expenses, ruled out of order, 332-4.
- Foreign Takeovers Review Act (Bill C-201): To decline second reading and introduce more comprehensive legislation, ruled out of order, 337-8.
- Foreign Takeovers Review Act (Bill C-201): To decline second reading and introduce legislation to cover established foreign-owned corporations, ruled out of order, 354.
- Election Expenses Act (Bill C-211): To supersede second reading by "six months' hoist", moved, debated and negatived on recorded division, 363-4.

Bills, Government; Report Stage:

- Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act (Bill C-8), 195-6.
- Old Age Security Act amendment (Bill C-207), 301-2, 306.
- Criminal Law Amendment Act (Bill C-2), 302.
- Canadian Wheat Board Act amendment (Bill C-204), 355, 422-3.
- Adult Occupational Training Act amendment (Bill C-195), 423-4.
- Foreign Takeovers Review Act (Bill C-201), 426, 429-31, 495-7, 500.
- Family Income Security Plan Act (Bill C-170), 433-7.
- Farm Credit Act amendment (Bill C-5), 438, 443-5.
- Canada Labour Code Act amendment (Bill C-183), 438, 487-91.

Bills, Government; Third Reading:

- Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act (Bill C-8): To defer and resolve that the action of the government is without constitutional authority, ruled out of order, 197.
- Income Tax Act amendment (Bill C-169): To defer and refer back to Committee of the Whole to reconsider clause 2, moved, debated and negatived on recorded division, 203.
- Criminal Law Amendment Act (Bill C-2): To defer and refer back to Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, moved and debate interrupted, 302. Debate resumed, amendment negatived on recorded division, 304-6.
- Old Age Security Act amendment (Bill C-207): To defer and refer back to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee to insert a new clause, ruled out of order, 306-7.
- Old Age Security Act amendment (Bill C-207): To defer and refer back to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee to lower age of entitlement and raise basic pension, ruled out of order, 307-8.
- Family Income Security Plan Act (Bill C-170): To defer and refer back to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee to reconsider clauses on means and income tests, moved and debate interrupted, 447. Debate resumed and adjourned on motion, 464. Debate resumed and interrupted, 504. Debate resumed, amendment negatived on recorded division, 505-6.

Bills, Private; Report Stage:

- United Bank of Canada Act (Bill C-164), 195.

Budget Debate:

- Amendment (1st appointed day) by Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West) to substitute: House regrets failure to relieve unemployment, stimulate investment and provide personal tax relief, moved, 291; negatived on recorded division, 328.
- Subamendment (1st appointed day) by Mr. Saltsman to add: Reduction in personal income tax should replace tax cuts to corporations, moved, 291; negatived on recorded division, 296-7.

Motion under S.O. 43:

- Amendment (Mr. Nielsen) to motion of Mr. Pringle that—International Joint Commission be authorized to requisition resources to restore environment, moved and debate interrupted, 371. Debate resumed and amendment agreed to, 375.

Amendments – (Concluded)**Supply Debate:**

- Amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre) to motion of Mr. Baldwin that—Standing Orders should be amended to provide adequate consideration of estimates: moved and negatived on recorded division, 46.
- Amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre) to motion of Mr. Rynard that—pensions and benefits should be raised to an adequate level: moved and negatived on recorded division, 211-2.
- Amendment (Mr. McGrath) to motion of Mrs. MacInnis that—Prices and Incomes Commission investigate and report on food price stability: ruled out of order, 348.
- Amendment (Mr. Woolliams) to motion of Mrs. MacInnis that—increased transportation costs be included: moved and negatived on recorded division, 349.
- Amendment (Mr. Benjamin) to motion of Mr. Thomas (Moncton) that—legislation be introduced providing for public ownership of Canadian Pacific Company: moved and debate interrupted, 357-8.

Animals:

- Order,—Reports by Canadian Council on Animal Care re use of animals for experimental purposes in certain agencies and departments: Mrs. MacInnis; order having been called, was transferred to the order of “Notices of Motions (Papers)”, 344.
- See also **Canada Wildlife Act; Criminal Code amendment; Protection of Endangered Species Act; Research Animals Protection Act.**

Anthem, National:

- See **National Anthem Act.**

Anti-dumping Tribunal:

- Report for 1971, 53. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/282.

Appendices to Votes and Proceedings:

- Notices of Ways and Means Motions to amend various Statutes, May 8, 1972 (Notice Paper).

Appropriation Bills:

- See **Supply Bills.**

Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act amendment:

- Bill C-186, Mr. Howard (Skeena). 1st R, 228.

Armed Forces:

- See **Canadian Armed Forces.**

Armed Forces Death Benefit Account:

- See **Public Service Superannuation Act.**

Arms and Ammunition:

- See **Criminal Code amendment.**

Army Benevolent Fund Board:

- Report for 1971-72, with auditor's report, 464. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/58.

Atlantic Pilotage Authority:

- Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 22 to *Journals*, 335.

Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Act amendment:

- Bill C-29, Mr. Thomas (Moncton). 1st R, 24.

Atlantic Region Transportation:

- Second report of federal-provincial committee, 357. Sess. Paper No. 284-5/32.

Atomic Energy:

1. Text of Note presented to French Government on Pacific nuclear tests, 283. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/107A.
2. Motion (by unanimous consent under S.O. 43),—That this House calls on nuclear powers to cease nuclear testing and Government of France to cancel tests in the Pacific Ocean, agreed to, 392.

See also **Agreements, Protocols, Exchange of Notes, Treaties, etc.**

Atomic Energy Control Board:

1. Report for 1971-72, 464. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/61.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to National Resources and Public Works Committee, 30. (Deemed reported—Issue 7 of Committee Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence).

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited:

1. Report for 1970-71, with auditor's report, 387. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/62.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to National Resources and Public Works Committee, 30. (Deemed reported—Issue 6 of Committee Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence).
3. Order,—Reports recommending responsibility for Deuterium of Canada Limited heavy water plant: Mr. Hellyer; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 246. Moved and debate interrupted, 332.

Atomic Tests:

See **Atomic Energy.**

Auditor General:

1. Report for 1970-71, 326. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/64.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 16 to *Journals*, 303.
3. Correspondence, dated Mar. 7 and 9, 1972, with Finance Minister re tabling of report for 1971, 51. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/2.
4. Ordered,—That Auditor General's complaint re government failure to provide facilities and subsequent delay in his report be referred to Public Accounts Committee and reported not later than Mar. 29, 1972, 51. Reported with recommendation re draft bill, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 7 to *Journals*, 207-8.
5. Ordered,—That Public Accounts Committee prepare a draft bill concerning office, function and powers, 224.
6. Motion, by unanimous consent,—That Auditor General's Reports for 1968-69 and 1969-70, with evidence adduced in previous sessions, be referred to Public Accounts Committee, agreed to, 291. Report for 1969-70 reported with recommendations, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 28 to *Journals*, 365-70. Report for 1968-69 reported with recommendations, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 37 to *Journals*, 465-71.
7. Motion,—That Auditor General's Report for 1970-71, be referred to Public Accounts Committee: Notice called and transferred to Government Orders, 337. Moved and agreed to, 363.

See also **Speaker's Rulings and Statements; Supply Motions.**

Automotive Safety:

Traffic Safety Report for 1970-71, 200. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/370.

See also **Motor Vehicle Safety Act amendment.**

Awards, Decorations and Honours:

1. Revised Constitution of the Order of Canada with letters patent and Order in Council P.C. 1972-809 approving same, 343. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/8.
2. Constitution of the Order of Military Merit with letters patent and Order in Council P.C. 1972-810 approving same, 343. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/8A.
3. Regulations re three decorations for bravery with letters patent and Order in Council P.C. 1972-811 approving same, 343. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/8B.
4. Directive re wearing of insignia of Canadian Orders and Decorations with Order in Council P.C. 1972-1206 approving same, 347. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/8C.

B**B.C. Indian Land Question Act:**

Bill C-166, Mr. Howard (Skeena). 1st R, 41.

Bank of Canada:

Report of Governor and statement of accounts, certified by auditors, for 1971, 204. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/65.

Bank of Canada Act amendment:

Bill C-28, Mr. Ricard (Braille Denomination). 1st R, 24.

Bilingualism:

See **Public Service**.

Bills, Private, and Petitions:

United Bank of Canada Act (Bill C-164)—*Mr. Haidasz*—(enacted as Chap. 24, S.C. 1972).

Bills, Public (Government and Private Members):

See also titles of particular bills; note below; **Procedure**; and **Speaker's Rulings and Statements**. (For numerical list by Bill Nos., see **Bills, Public** in *Index to Debates*).

1. Administrative Review Board Act (Bill C-226)—*Mr. Rose*—(died on Order Paper).
2. Adult Occupational Training Act amendment (Bill C-96)—*Mrs. MacInnis*—(died on Order Paper).
3. Adult Occupational Training Act amendment (Eligibility Requirements) (Bill C-195)—*The Minister of Manpower and Immigration*—(enacted as Chap. 14, S.C. 1972).
4. Alaska-Yukon Highway Authority Act (Alaska Highway) (Bill C-70)—*Mr. Thompson* (Red Deer)—(died on Order Paper).
5. Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act amendment (Bill C-186)—*Mr. Howard* (Skeena)—(died on Order Paper).
6. Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Act amendment (Bill C-29)—*Mr. Thomas* (Moncton)—(died on Order Paper).
7. B.C. Indian Land Question Act (Bill C-166)—*Mr. Howard* (Skeena)—(died on Order Paper).
8. Bank of Canada Act amendment (Braille Denomination) (Bill C-28)—*Mr. Ricard*—(died on Order Paper).
9. Blue Water Bridge Authority Act amendment (Public and Financial Accountability) (Bill C-16)—*Mr. McCutcheon*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).
10. British North America Act, 1867 to 1965, amendment (Re: Abolition of the Senate) (Bill C-71)—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre)—(died on Order Paper).
11. British North America Act, 1867 to 1965, amendment (Re: Duration of House of Commons) (Bill C-112)—*Mr. Peters*—(died on Order Paper).
12. British North America Act, 1867 to 1965, amendment (Re: Duration of House of Commons) (Bill C-123)—*Mr. Rowland*—(died on Order Paper).
13. British North America Act, 1867 to 1965, amendment (Re: House of Commons, Quorum) (Bill C-63)—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre)—(died on Order Paper).

Bills, Public (Government and Private Members) – (Continued)

14. British North America Act, 1867 to 1965, amendment (Re: National Capital of Canada) (Bill C-117)—*Mr. Isabelle*—(died on Order Paper).
15. British North America Act, 1867 to 1965, amendment (Re: Representation) (Bill C-3)—*The President of the Privy Council*—(died on Order Paper).
16. British North America Act, 1867 to 1965, amendment (Re: Retirement Age of Members of the House of Commons) (Bill C-173)—*Mr. Reid*—(died on Order Paper).
17. British North America Act, 1867 to 1965, amendment (Re: Yukon and N.W.T. Senate Representation) (Bill C-126)—*Mr. Nielsen*—(died on Order Paper).
18. Broadcasting Act amendment (Advertising on Children's Programs) (Bill C-65)—*Mr. McGrath*—(died on Order Paper).
19. Broadcasting Act amendment (Cigarette Advertising) (Bill C-26)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
20. Broadcasting Act amendment (Equal Time to Opposition Parties) (Bill C-145)—*Mr. Orlikow*—(died on Order Paper).
21. Broadcasting Act amendment (Free Time for Political Candidates) (Bill C-73)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
22. Canada Boat Safety Act (Bill C-14)—*Mr. Mather*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).
23. Canada Cancer Foundation Act (Bill C-168)—*Mr. Badanai*—(died on Order Paper).
24. Canada Corporations Act amendment (Not Agents of Her Majesty) (Bill C-154)—*Mr. Fortin*—(died on Order Paper).
25. Canada Day Act (Bill C-64)—*Mr. Gibson*—(died on Order Paper).
26. Canada Day Act (Bill C-148)—*Mr. Broadbent*—(died on Order Paper).
27. Canada Development Corporation Act amendment (Mineral Processing) (Bill C-210)—*Mr. Howard (Skeena)*—(died on Order Paper).
28. Canada Elections Act amendment (Election Expenses) (Bill C-87)—*Mr. Roberts*—(died on Order Paper).
29. Canada Elections Act amendment (Political Party, Registration) (Bill C-174)—*Mr. Hellyer*—(died on Order Paper).
30. Canada Elections Act amendment (Prisoners Enfranchised) (Bill C-202)—*Mr. MacDonald (Egmont)*—(died on Order Paper).
31. Canada Elections Act amendment (Proxy Voting) (Bill C-25)—*Mr. Horner*—(died on Order Paper).
32. Canada Elections Act amendment (Proxy Voting) (Bill C-33)—*Mr. Kaplan*—(died on Order Paper).
33. Canada Elections Act amendment (Publication of Straw Poll Results) (Bill C-47)—*Mr. Peters*—(died on Order Paper).
34. Canada Elections Act amendment (Publication of the Result of Opinion Polls) (Bill C-15)—*Mr. Coates*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).

Bills, Public (Government and Private Members) – (Continued)

35. Canada Evidence Act amendment (Incriminating Statements) (Bill C-80)—*Mr. Orlikow*—(died on Order Paper).
36. Canada Human Rights Code (Bill C-105)—*Mrs. MacInnis*—(died on Order Paper).
37. Canada Labour Code Act amendment (Bill C-183)—*The Minister of Labour*—(enacted as Chap. 18, S.C. 1972).
38. Canada Labour Code and Public Service Employment Act amendment (Bill C-206)—*The Minister of Labour*—(died on Order Paper).
39. Canada Labour (Standards) Code Act amendment (Age or Sex Discrimination) (Bill C-100)—*Mr. Forrestall*—(died on Order Paper).
40. Canada Labour (Standards) Code Act amendment (Fair Employment Practices) (Bill C-99)—*Mr. Allmand*—(died on Order Paper).
41. Canada Labour (Standards) Code Act amendment (Increased Minimum Wage) (Bill C-89)—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre)—(died on Order Paper).
42. Canada Labour (Standards) Code Act amendment (Pension on Permanent Closing) (Bill C-163)—*Mr. Thomson* (Battleford-Kindersley)—(died on Order Paper).
43. Canada Labour (Standards) Code Act amendment (Retirement Plan) (Bill C-162)—*Mr. Thomson* (Battleford-Kindersley)—(died on Order Paper).
44. Canada Labour (Standards) Code Act amendment (Severance Pay) (Bill C-114)—*Mr. Peters*—(died on Order Paper).
45. Canada Labour (Standards) Code Act amendment (Tenth General Holiday with Pay) (Bill C-21)—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre)—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).
46. Canada Labour (Standards) Code Act amendment (Three Weeks Vacation) (Bill C-81)—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre)—(died on Order Paper).
47. Canada Pension Plan Act amendment (Housewives) (Bill C-188)—*Mr. Rowland*—(died on Order Paper).
48. Canada Shipping Act amendment (Vessel Bridge-to-Bridge Radiotelephone) (Bill C-189)—*Mr. Anderson*—(died on Order Paper).
49. Canada Wildlife Act (Bill C-191)—*The Minister of the Environment*—(died on Order Paper).
50. Canadian Business Records Protection Act (Bill C-131)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
51. Canadian Citizenship Act amendment (Bill C-66)—*Mr. Allmand*—(died on Order Paper).
52. Canadian Citizenship Act amendment (Freedom of Conscience) (Bill C-95)—*Mr. Peters*—(died on Order Paper).
53. Canadian Citizenship Act amendment (Minimum Residence Requirement) (Bill C-165)—*Mr. Prud'homme*—(died on Order Paper).
54. Canadian Citizenship Act amendment (Oath of Allegiance) (Bill C-18)—*Mr. Allmand*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).

Bills, Public (Government and Private Members) – (Continued)

55. Canadian Citizenship Act amendment (Time off without Loss of Pay for Appearance in Citizenship Court) (Bill C-103)—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre)—(died on Order Paper).
56. Canadian Flag Day Act (Bill C-132)—*Mr. Haidasz*—(died on Order Paper).
57. Canadian National Railways Financing and Guarantee Act (Bill C-4)—*The Minister of Finance*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).
58. Canadian Status Act (Bill C-134)—*Mr. Downey*—(died on Order Paper).
59. Canadian Wheat Board Act amendment (Bill C-204)—*The Minister of Justice*—(enacted as Chap. 16, S.C. 1972).
60. Certification of Masters Act (Bill C-192)—*Mr. Groos*—(died on Order Paper).
61. Cigarette Tar and Nicotine Content Act (Bill C-125)—*Mr. Robinson*—(died on Order Paper).
62. Combines Investigation Act amendment (Floor Penalties, Criminal Joint Tortfeasors, and Moieties) (Bill C-13)—*Mr. Orlikow*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).
63. Commuter Passenger Train Authority (Ontario) Act (Bill C-24)—*Mr. Roberts*—(died on Order Paper).
64. Conservation Day Act (Bill C-151)—*Mr. Sulatycky*—(died on Order Paper).
65. Consumption Date of Packaged Perishable Food Act (Bill C-34)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
66. Continental Shelf Act (Bill C-111)—*Mr. McGrath*—(died on Order Paper).
67. Copyright Act amendment (Bill C-229)—*Mr. Rose*—(died on Order Paper).
68. Criminal Code amendment (Abolition of Corporal Punishment) (Bill C-9)—*Mr. MacDonald* (Egmont)—(Order for 2nd R discharged and Bill withdrawn).
69. Criminal Code amendment (Abortion) (Bill C-76)—*Mrs. MacInnis*—(died on Order Paper).
70. Criminal Code amendment (Adjournment for Accused to Obtain Legal Representation) (Bill C-143)—*Mr. Allmand*—(died on Order Paper).
71. Criminal Code amendment (Air and Water Pollution) (Bill C-137)—*Mr. Allmand*—(died on Order Paper).
72. Criminal Code amendment (Air Piracy) (Bill C-37)—*Mr. Robinson*—(died on Order Paper).
73. Criminal Code amendment (Air Piracy) (Bill C-51)—*Mr. Woolliams*—(died on Order Paper).
74. Criminal Code amendment (Alteration of Odometer) (Bill C-60)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
75. Criminal Code amendment (Attempt to Commit Suicide) (Bill C-20)—*Mr. Watson*—(died on Order Paper).
76. Criminal Code amendment (Attempted Suicide) (Bill C-144)—*Mr. Forrestall*—(died on Order Paper).
77. Criminal Code amendment (Attempted Suicide) (Bill C-155)—*Mr. Robinson*—(died on Order Paper).
78. Criminal Code amendment (Battered Child) (Bill C-120)—*Mr. Southam*—(died on Order Paper).
79. Criminal Code amendment (Canadian and Provincial Flags) (Bill C-197)—*Mr. Hopkins*—(died on Order Paper).

Bills, Public (Government and Private Members) – (Continued)

80. Criminal Code amendment (Company-censored Housing) (Bill C-62)—*Mr. Orlikow*—(died on Order Paper).
81. Criminal Code amendment (Control of Weapons and Firearms) (Bill C-36)—*Mr. Allmand*—(died on Order Paper).
82. Criminal Code amendment (Cruelty to Animals) (Bill C-113)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
83. Criminal Code amendment (Disturbance in Parliament) (Bill C-67)—*Mr. Stewart* (Cochrane)—(died on Order Paper).
84. Criminal Code amendment (Foreign Flags) (Bill C-198)—*Mr. Hopkins*—(died on Order Paper).
85. Criminal Code amendment (Kidnapping) (Bill C-139)—*Mr. Caouette*—(died on Order Paper).
86. Criminal Code amendment (Obliteration of Motor Vehicle Serial Numbers) (Bill C-142)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
87. Criminal Code amendment (Off-track Betting) (Bill C-225)—*The Minister of Justice*—(died on Order Paper).
88. Criminal Code amendment (Pollution) (Bill C-32)—*Mr. Anderson*—(died on Order Paper).
89. Criminal Code amendment (Preventive Detention) (Bill C-35)—*Mr. Orlikow*—(died on Order Paper).
90. Criminal Code amendment (Vagrancy) (Bill C-43)—*Mr. Robinson*—(died on Order Paper).
91. Criminal Code amendment (Wiretapping) (Bill C-83)—*Mr. Orlikow*—(died on Order Paper).
92. Criminal Code amendment (Young Offenders) (Bill C-135)—*Mr. Woolliams*—(died on Order Paper).
93. Criminal Law Amendment Act (Bill C-2)—*The Minister of Justice*—(enacted as Chap. 13, S.C. 1972).
94. Criminal Records Act amendment (Bill C-22)—*Mr. Robinson*—(died on Order Paper).
95. Criminal Records Act amendment (Young Offenders) (Bill C-205)—*Mr. Rynard*—(died on Order Paper).
96. Crown Corporations Act (Members of Parliament as Directors) (Bill C-54)—*Mr. Stewart* (Cochrane)—(died on Order Paper).
97. Customs Tariff Act amendment (Bill C-224)—*The Minister of Finance*—(died on Order Paper).
98. Data Privacy Act (Bill C-75)—*Mr. Goode*—(died on Order Paper).
99. Designation of the Speaker of the House of Commons as Member for Parliament Hill Act (Bill C-101)—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre)—(died on Order Paper).
100. Detergents Labelling Act (Bill C-147)—*Mrs. MacInnis*—(died on Order Paper).
101. Disabled Persons' Transportation Act (Bill C-138)—*Mr. Nesbitt*—(died on Order Paper).
102. Disclosure of Financial Interests Act (Bill C-91)—*Mr. Roberts*—(died on Order Paper).
103. Disclosure of Interests Act (Bill C-38)—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre)—(died on Order Paper).
104. Divorce Act amendment (Bill C-69)—*Mr. McCleave*—(died on Order Paper).

Bills, Public (Government and Private Members) – (Continued)

105. Drug Addicts Disclosure Act (Bill C-72)—*Mr. Haidasz*—(died on Order Paper).
106. Election Expenses Act (Bill C-211)—*The President of the Privy Council*—(died in Privileges and Elections Committee).
107. Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment (Essex-Windsor) (Bill C-55)—*Mr. Whelan*—(enacted as Chap. 3, S.C. 1972).
108. Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment (High Park-Humber Valley) (Bill C-74)—*Mr. Deakon*—(enacted as Chap. 4, S.C. 1972).
109. Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment (Metropolitan Trois Rivières) (Bill C-167)—*Mr. Lajoie*—(enacted as Chap. 7, S.C. 1972).
110. Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment (Renfrew North-Nipissing East) (Bill C-92)—*Mr. Hopkins*—(enacted as Chap. 5, S.C. 1972).
111. Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment (Representation Commissioner) (Bill C-50)—*Mr. Lambert* (Edmonton West)—(died on Order Paper).
112. Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment (Rivière du Loup-Temiscouata) (Bill C-172)—*Mr. Gendron*—(enacted as Chap. 6, S.C. 1972).
113. Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment (Rules) (Bill C-212)—*Mr. Reid*—(died on Order Paper).
114. Environment Department Act amendment (Fisheries) (Bill C-40)—*Mr. McGrath*—(died on Order Paper).
115. Environmental Council of Canada Act (Bill C-12)—*Mr. Goode*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).
116. Excessive Outdoor Noises Act (Bill C-161)—*Mr. Badanai*—(died on Order Paper).
117. Excise Tax Act amendment (Bill C-223)—*The Minister of Finance*—(died on Order Paper).
118. Exhibitions Assistance Act (Bill C-214)—*The Minister of Agriculture*—(died on Order Paper).
119. Explosives Act amendment (Bill C-7)—*The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).
120. Exportation of the Growth and Produce of Canada Act (Bill C-79)—*Mr. Peters*—(died on Order Paper).
121. Fair Credit Reporting Act (Bill C-104)—*Mr. McGrath*—(died on Order Paper).
122. Family Income Security Plan Act (Bill C-170)—*The Minister of National Health and Welfare*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 3rd R died on Order Paper).
123. Farm Credit Act amendment (Bill C-5)—*The Minister of Agriculture*—(enacted as Chap. 19, S.C. 1972).
124. Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act (Bill C-8)—*The Minister of Finance*—(enacted as Chap. 8, S.C. 1972).
125. Federal Transport Commission of Inquiry Act (Bill C-85)—*Mr. Forrestall*—(died on Order Paper).
126. Financial Administration Act amendment (Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration) (Bill C-86)—*Mr. Thompson* (Red Deer)—(died on Order Paper).

Bills, Public (Government and Private Members) – (Continued)

127. Financial Administration Act amendment (Public Accounts) (Bill C-141)—*Mr. Hales*—(died on Order Paper).
128. Fisheries Act amendment (Licensing) (Bill C-41)—*Mr. Barnett*—(died on Order Paper).
129. Food and Drugs Act amendment (Cigarette Advertising) (Bill C-190)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
130. Food and Drugs Act amendment (Labelling) (Bill C-77)—*Mr. Anderson*—(died on Order Paper).
131. Food and Drugs Act amendment (Labelling of Dates on Perishable Commodities) (Bill C-116)—*Mr. MacDonald* (Egmont)—(died on Order Paper).
132. Food and Drugs Act amendment (Tobacco Products) (Bill C-58)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
133. Foreign Takeovers Review Act (Bill C-201)—*The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce*—(Order for Resuming Debate on Report Stage died on Order Paper).
134. Foreign Vessels Construction Standards Act (Bill C-193)—*Mr. Groos*—(died on Order Paper).
135. Foster Grandparents of Canada Act (Bill C-119)—*Mr. Ryan*—(died on Order Paper).
136. Government Contracts Employment Act (Bill C-19)—*Mr. Orlikow*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).
137. Harbour Commission Act amendment (Commission Membership) (Bill C-227)—*Mr. Rose*—(died on Order Paper).
138. Haulage of Loose Materials Safety Act (Bill C-159)—*Mr. Skoberg*—(died on Order Paper).
139. Hazardous Household Products Labelling Act (Bill C-146)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
140. Holidays Act amendment (Victoria Day) (Bill C-84)—*Mr. Scott*—(died on Order Paper).
141. Immigration Act amendment (Mental Retardation) (Bill C-136)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
142. Immigration Appeal Board Act amendment (Bill C-23)—*Mr. Haidasz*—(died on Order Paper).
143. Income Tax Act amendment (Bill C-169)—*The Minister of Finance*—(based on Ways and Means motion agreed to on Feb. 22, 1972; enacted as Chap. 9, S.C. 1972).
144. Income Tax Act amendment (Bill C-222)—*The Minister of Finance*—(based on Ways and Means motion agreed to on June 26, 1972; died on Order Paper).
145. Income Tax Act amendment (Section 239) (Bill C-44)—*Mr. Lambert* (Edmonton West)—(died on Order Paper).
146. Indian Act amendment (Rights of Indian Women upon Marriage) (Bill C-124)—*Mr. Rock*—(died on Order Paper).
147. Indian Act amendment (Voting Age on Reserves) (Bill C-27)—*Mr. Foster*—(died on Order Paper).
148. Indian Act amendment (Voting Age on Reserves) (Bill C-156)—*Mr. St. Pierre*—(died on Order Paper).
149. Indian Hunting and Fishing Rights Act (Bill C-108)—*Mr. Simpson*—(died on Order Paper).

Bills, Public (Government and Private Members) – (Continued)

150. Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act amendment (Charity versus Closed Shop) (Bill C-48)—*Mr. Lambert* (Edmonton West)—(died on Order Paper).
151. Industrial Research and Development Incentives Act amendment (Bill C-218)—*Mr. Knight*—(died on Order Paper).
152. Industry, Trade and Commerce Department Act amendment (Bill C-196)—*The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce*—(died on Order Paper).
153. Industry, Trade and Commerce Department Act amendment (Public Disclosure) (Bill C-219)—*Mr. Broadbent*—(died on Order Paper).
154. Inquiries Act amendment (Publication of Reports) (Bill C-149)—*Mr. Alexander*—(died on Order Paper).
155. International River Improvements Act amendment (Bill C-93)—*Mr. Goode*—(died on Order Paper).
156. Justice Department Act amendment (Annual Report) (Bill C-30)—*Mr. Fortin*—(died on Order Paper).
157. Juvenile Delinquents Act amendment (Bill C-57)—*Mr. Robinson*—(died on Order Paper).
158. Lobbying Control Act (Bill C-121)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
159. Major's Hill Park Act (Bill C-31)—*Mr. Stewart* (Cochrane)—(died on Order Paper).
160. Marine Traffic Control (West Coast) Act (Bill C-194)—*Mr. Groos*—(died on Order Paper).
161. Motor Vehicle Safety Act amendment (Bumpers) (Bill C-82)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
162. Motor Vehicle Safety Act amendment (Seat Belts) (Bill C-17)—*Mr. Mather*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).
163. National Anthem Act (Bill C-158)—*The Secretary of State*—(died on Order Paper).
164. National Defence Act amendment (Aid to the Civil Power) (Bill C-107)—*Mr. Orlikow*—(died on Order Paper).
165. National Flag Act (Bill C-46)—*Mr. Stewart* (Cochrane)—(died on Order Paper).
166. National Housing Act amendment (Bill C-213)—*The Minister of State for Urban Affairs*—(died on Order Paper).
167. National Housing Act amendment (Municipal Water and Soil Pollution Projects) (Bill C-122)—*Mr. Alexander*—(died on Order Paper).
168. National Parks Act amendment (Bill C-200)—*The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development*—(died on Order Paper).
169. Newfoundland Crossing Authority Act (Bill C-45)—*Mr. Marshall*—(died on Order Paper).
170. News Sources Protection Act (Press Privilege) (Bill C-42)—*Mr. Peters*—(died on Order Paper).
171. News Sources Protection Act (Press Privilege) (Bill C-130)—*Mr. Fairweather*—(died on Order Paper).
172. Northwest Territories Air Transportation Employees Act (Bill C-109)—*Mr. Orange*—(died on Order Paper).
173. Oaths of Office (*pro forma* Bill C-1)—*The Prime Minister*

Bills, Public (Government and Private Members) – (Continued)

174. Old Age Security Act amendment (Bill C-207)—*The Minister of National Health and Welfare*—(enacted as Chap. 10, S.C. 1972).
175. Old Age Security and Canada Pension Plan Acts amendment (Reduction in Qualifying Age) (Bill C-129)—*Mr. Allmand*—(died on Order Paper).
176. Paper Recycling Act (Bill C-90)—*Mr. Goode*—(died on Order Paper).
177. “Parliament Hill” Act (Prohibition of Commercial Use) (Bill C-78)—*Mr. McIlraith*—(enacted as Chap. 11, S.C. 1972).
178. Parliamentary Commissioner Act (Bill C-52)—*Mr. Thompson* (Red Deer)—(died on Order Paper).
179. Pension Act amendment (Bill C-215)—*The Minister of Veterans Affairs*—(enacted as Chap. 20, S.C. 1972).
180. Pension Benefits Standards Act amendment (Information to Employees) (Bill C-228)—*Mr. Rose*—(died on Order Paper).
181. Plant Noise Abatement Act (Bill C-39)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
182. Poison Prevention Packaging Act (Bill C-110)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
183. Protection of Endangered Species Act (Bill C-68)—*Mr. Watson*—(died on Order Paper).
184. Protection of Privacy Act (Bill C-6)—*The Minister of Justice*—(died on Order Paper at Report Stage).
185. Public Service Employment Act amendment (Age Discrimination) (Bill C-115)—*Mr. Forrestall*—(died on Order Paper).
186. Public Service Employment Act amendment (Political Partisanship) (Bill C-127)—*Mr. Burton*—(died on Order Paper).
187. Public Service Staff Relations Act amendment (Collective Bargaining) (Bill C-140)—*Mr. Orlikow*—(died on Order Paper).
188. Public Service Staff Relations Act amendment (Designated Employees) (Bill C-97)—*Mr. Allmand*—(died on Order Paper).
189. Public’s Rights to Freedom of Access to Public Documents Act (Bill C-98)—*Mr. Mather*—(died on Order Paper).
190. Public’s Rights to Freedom of Access to Public Documents Act (Bill C-128)—*Mr. Roberts*—(died on Order Paper).
191. Railway Act amendment (Deviations, changes and removal) (Bill C-199)—*Mr. Skoberg*—(died on Order Paper).
192. Railway Act amendment (Notice of Accidents) (Bill C-160)—*Mr. Skoberg*—(died on Order Paper).
193. Railway Act amendment (Reduction in Passenger Service) (Bill C-133)—*Mr. Allmand*—(died on Order Paper).
194. Regional Development Incentives Act amendment (Economic/Social Factors) (Bill C-59)—*Mr. MacDonald* (Egmont)—(died on Order Paper).

Bills, Public (Government and Private Members) – (Continued)

195. Regional Development Incentives Act amendment (Evaluation of Grants) (Bill C-216)—*Mr. Knight*—(died on Order Paper).
196. Regional Development Incentives Act amendment (Public Funds) (Bill C-220)—*Mr. Broadbent*—(died on Order Paper).
197. Regional Development Incentives Act amendment (Scrutiny of Applications) (Bill C-217)—*Mr. Knight*—(died on Order Paper).
198. Regional Economic Expansion Department Act amendment (Bill C-49)—*Mr. MacDonald* (Egmont)—(died on Order Paper).
199. Representation Commissioner Act amendment (Bill C-203)—*The Secretary of State*—(enacted as Chap. 21, S.C. 1972).
200. Research Animals Protection Act (Bill C-171)—*Mr. Groos*—(died on Order Paper).
201. Residential Mortgage Financing Act (Bill C-209)—*The Minister of State for Urban Affairs*—(died on Order Paper).
202. Rideau Palace Act (Bill C-53)—*Mr. McBride*—(died on Order Paper).
203. Right to Information Act (Bill C-118)—*Mr. Baldwin*—(died on Order Paper).
204. St. Lawrence Ports Operations Act (Bill C-230)—*The Minister of Labour*—(enacted as Chap. 22, S.C. 1972).
205. Senate and House of Commons Act amendment (St. Luke 11:46) (Bill C-88)—*Mr. Anderson*—(died on Order Paper).
206. Sir John A. Macdonald Day Act (Bill C-102)—*Mr. Macquarrie*—(died on Order Paper).
207. Small Loans Act amendment (Bill C-187)—*Mr. Rowland*—(died on Order Paper).
208. Statistics Act amendment (Area Statistics) (Bill C-61)—*Mr. MacDonald* (Egmont)—(died on Order Paper).
209. Supersonic Aircraft Act (Bill C-106)—*Mr. St. Pierre*—(died on Order Paper).
210. Supply (1st Supplementary of this Session, based on Supp. Estimates, 1971-72) (Bill C-175)—*The President of the Treasury Board*—(enacted as Chap. 1, S.C. 1972).
211. Supply (1st Interim of this Session, based on Estimates, 1972-73) (Bill C-176)—*The President of the Treasury Board*—(enacted as Chap. 2, S.C. 1972).
212. Supply (Main, based on Estimates, 1972-73) (Bill C-221)—*The President of the Treasury Board*—(enacted as Chap. 15, S.C. 1972).
213. Supreme Court Act amendment (Judicial Office) (Bill C-150)—*Mr. McCleave*—(died on Order Paper).
214. Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act amendment (Continental Shelf) (Bill C-11)—*Mr. Anderson*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).
215. Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act amendment (Extending Fishing Zones) (Bill C-157)—*Mr. Howard* (Skeena)—(died on Order Paper).

Bills, Public (Government and Private Members) – (Concluded)

216. Territorial Supreme Courts Act (Bill S-3)—*The Minister of Justice*—(originated in Senate; enacted as Chap. 17, S.C. 1972).
217. Tobacco Health Hazard Act (Bill C-152)—*Mr. Robinson*—(died on Order Paper).
218. Tobacco Restraint Act (Bill C-10)—*Mr. Mather*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).
219. Transport Department Act amendment (Bill C-56)—*Mr. Orlikow*—(died on Order Paper).
220. Unemployment Insurance Act amendment (Benefits at Time of Retirement) (Bill C-182)—*Mr. Knowles* (Winnipeg North Centre)—(died on Order Paper).
221. Unemployment Insurance Act amendment (Holiday Pay) (Bill C-180)—*Mr. Peters*—(Order for Resuming Debate on 2nd R died on Order Paper).
222. Unemployment Insurance Act amendment (Justitia Pro Societas) (Bill C-185)—*Mr. Howard* (Skeena)—(died on Order Paper).
223. Unemployment Insurance Act amendment (Labour Disputes) (Bill C-178)—*Mr. Skoberg*—(died on Order Paper).
224. Unemployment Insurance Act amendment (Maternity Benefits) (Bill C-179)—*Mrs. MacInnis*—(died on Order Paper).
225. Unemployment Insurance Act amendment (Retirement Benefits) (Bill C-181)—*Mr. Peters*—(died on Order Paper).
226. Unemployment Insurance Act amendment (Sick Leave Pay) (Bill C-177)—*Mr. Blackburn*—(died on Order Paper).
227. Vancouver International Airport Act (Bill C-94)—*Mr. Goode*—(died on Order Paper).
228. War Measures Act amendment (Bill C-153)—*Mr. Orlikow*—(died on Order Paper).
229. War Pensions and Allowances Acts amendment (Bill C-208)—*The Minister of Veterans Affairs*—(enacted as Chap. 12, S.C. 1972).
230. West Coast Marine Traffic Reporting Zone Act (Bill C-184)—*Mr. Groos*—(died on Order Paper).
231. West Coast Ports Operations Act (Bill C-231)—*The Minister of Labour*—(enacted as Chap. 23, S.C. 1972).

Blind Persons:

See **Bank of Canada Act** amendment.

Blind Persons Act:

Report on administration of allowances for 1970-71, 383. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/73.

Blue Water Bridge Authority Act amendment:

Bill C-16, Mr. McCutcheon (Public and Financial Accountability). 1st R, 23. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 317.

Boat Safety Act:

See **Canada Boat Safety Act**.

Bretton Woods Agreements Act:

Report on operations for 1971, 233. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/74.

British North America Act amendment:

1. Bill C-3, President of the Privy Council (Representation). 1st R, 11.
2. Bill C-63, Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) (House of Commons, Quorum). 1st R, 24.
3. Bill C-71, Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) (Abolition of the Senate). 1st R, 25.
4. Bill C-112, Mr. Peters (Duration of House of Commons). 1st R, 25.
5. Bill C-117, Mr. Isabelle (National Capital of Canada). 1st R, 25.
6. Bill C-123, Mr. Rowland (Duration of House of Commons). 1st R, 26.
7. Bill C-126, Mr. Nielsen (Yukon and N.W.T. Senate Representation). 1st R, 26.
8. Bill C-173, Mr. Reid (Retirement Age of Members of the House of Commons). 1st R, 201.
9. Motion (Minister of Transport),—That an Address be presented to Her Majesty the Queen re a measure concerning education in Newfoundland: Notice called and transferred to Government Orders, 277-8.

Broadcasting Act amendment:

1. Bill C-26, Mr. Mather (Cigarette Advertising). 1st R, 24.
2. Bill C-65, Mr. McGrath (Advertising on Children's Programs). 1st R, 24.
3. Bill C-73, Mr. Mather (Free Time for Political Candidates). 1st R, 25.
4. Bill C-145, Mr. Orlikow (Equal Time to Opposition Parties). 1st R, 26.

Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee:

1. Membership, 41, 48, 52, 218, 239, 256, 276, 302, 334, 338, 342.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Canada Council, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Canadian Radio-Television Commission, Company of Young Canadians, Information Canada, National Arts Centre Corporation, National Film Board, National Library, National Museums, Public Archives, Secretary of State Department, 29.
3. Referred: Subject-matter of refusal of Public Service Commission to allow C.R.T.C. employee, Anne Booth, to seek political nomination, 65.
4. Reports: First (Public Service Commission, refusal to allow C.R.T.C. employee to seek political nomination) (Appendix 9 to *Journals*), 221-2; Second (Canadian Radio-Television Commission, Main Estimates, 1972-73, with recommendations re C.R.T.C. decision on Mississauga cablevision) (Appendix 17 to *Journals*), 303-4.

Budget:

See Ways and Means.

C**Canada Assistance Plan:**

Report on administration for 1969-70, 424. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/77.

Canada Boat Safety Act:

Bill C-14, Mr. Mather. 1st R, 23. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 235.

Canada Cancer Foundation Act:

Bill C-168, Mr. Badanai. 1st R, 49.

Canada Corporations Act amendment:

Bill C-154, Mr. Fortin (Not Agents of Her Majesty). 1st R, 26.

Canada Council:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee, 29.

Canada Day Act:

1. Bill C-64, Mr. Gibson. 1st R, 24.
2. Bill C-148, Mr. Broadbent. 1st R, 26.

Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation:

Report for 1971, together with financial statement certified by Auditor General, 229. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/78.

Canada Development Corporation Act amendment:

Bill C-210, Mr. Howard (Skeena) (Mineral Processing). 1st R, 300.

Canada Elections Act:

1. Order in Council P.C. 1971-784, dated Apr. 23, 1971, revoking Yukon and Northwest Territories Electoral Districts Election Fees Tariff, 10. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/402.
2. Order in Council P.C. 1971-785, dated Apr. 23, 1971, substituting a new Federal Elections Fees Tariff, 10. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/402A.
3. Order in Council P.C. 1971-786, dated Apr. 23, 1971, revoking the Canadian Forces Elections Fees Tariff and substituting Special Voting Rules General Elections Fees Tariff, 10. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/402B.

Canada Elections Act amendment:

1. Bill C-15, Mr. Coates (Publication of the Result of Opinion Polls). 1st R, 23. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 242.
2. Bill C-25, Mr. Horner (Proxy Voting). 1st R, 24.
3. Bill C-33, Mr. Kaplan (Proxy Voting). 1st R, 24.
4. Bill C-47, Mr. Peters (Publication of Straw Poll Results). 1st R, 24.
5. Bill C-87, Mr. Roberts (Election Expenses). 1st R, 25.
6. Bill C-174, Mr. Hellyer (Political Party, Registration). 1st R, 211.
7. Bill C-202, Mr. MacDonald (Egmont) (Prisoners Enfranchised). 1st R, 279.

Canada Evidence Act amendment:

Bill C-80, Mr. Orlikow (Incriminating Statements). 1st R, 25.

Canada Gazette, Part II:

See **Statutory Orders and Regulations**.

Canada Human Rights Code:

Bill C-105, Mrs. MacInnis. 1st R, 25.

Canada-Japan Relations:

Final joint press release on scientific and technological mission to Japan, Mar. 6-15, 1972, 201. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/117.

See also **Copper**.

Canada Labour Code:

Report on proceedings under Part V (Industrial Relations) for 1971-72, 246. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/406.

Canada Labour Code Act amendment:

Bill C-183, Minister of Labour—To provide for continuation of the Canada Labour Relations Board; to establish Industrial Inquiry Commissions and conciliation boards, and provide for related matters. 1st R, 224. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 232. Debate resumed and interrupted, 235-6, 238. Debate resumed, 2nd R agreed to, on recorded division, referred to Labour, Manpower and Immigration Committee, 241-2. Reported with amendments, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 30 to *Journals*, 391-2. Report stage, 438, 487-91. Motions to amend, negatived, 485; negatived on recorded division, 489-91. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 491. 3rd R agreed to, 491. Passed by Senate, 504. R.A., 506. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 18, S.C. 1972.

Canada Labour Code and Public Service Employment Act amendment:

Bill C-206, Minister of Labour. 1st R, 283-4.

Canada Labour (Standards) Code:

Report on proceedings for 1971-72, 493. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/82.

Canada Labour (Standards) Code Act amendment:

1. Bill C-21, Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) (Tenth General Holiday with Pay). 1st R, 24. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 491.
2. Bill C-81, Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) (Three Weeks Vacation). 1st R, 25.
3. Bill C-89, Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) (Increased Minimum Wage). 1st R, 25.
4. Bill C-99, Mr. Allmand (Fair Employment Practices). 1st R, 25.
5. Bill C-100, Mr. Forrestall (Age or Sex Discrimination). 1st R, 25.
6. Bill C-114, Mr. Peters (Severance Pay). 1st R, 25.
7. Bill C-162, Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley) (Retirement Plan). 1st R, 35.
8. Bill C-163, Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley) (Pension on Permanent Closing). 1st R, 36.

Canada Pension Plan:

Report for 1970-71, 256. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/83.

See also **Old Age Security Act**.

Canada Pension Plan Act:

See **Old Age Security and Canada Pension Plan Acts amendment**.

Canada Pension Plan Act amendment:

Bill C-188, Mr. Rowland (Housewives). 1st R, 231.

Canada Shipping Act amendment:

Bill C-189, Mr. Anderson (Vessel Bridge-to-Bridge Radiotelephone). 1st R, 245.

Canada Student Loans Plan:

Report on administration for year ended June 30, 1971, 57. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/245.

Canada-United States Agreements, Notes, etc.:

Pollution: Agreement on Great Lakes water quality, 237. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/141.

Canada Wildlife Act:

Bill C-191, Minister of the Environment—To provide for research and conservation agreements; to provide for acquisition of lands and to provide for all costs incurred. 1st R, 245.

Canada, 1972:

Copies of official Handbook, 51. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/321A.

Canadian Armed Forces:

1. Order,—Return re reserve regiments, number, names, strength and salaries for 1971: Mr. Latulippe—presented forthwith, 201. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/120.
2. Order,—Return re pay and allowances scale for all ranks: Mr. MacRae—presented forthwith, 246. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/380.
3. Order,—Return re bases closed since 1965, disposal of land and buildings, civilian personnel laid off: Mr. Stewart (Marquette)—presented forthwith, 271-2. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/228.
4. Address,—Correspondence, etc. with Great Britain re use of Suffield experimental station in Alta. by British troops: Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), 443. Presented, 492. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/58.

Canadian Arsenals Limited:

1. Report for 1971-72, with auditor's report, 493. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/85.
2. Capital budget for 1972-73, 215. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/85A.
3. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30.

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation:

1. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee, 29.
2. Order,—Return re employees speaking Indian or Eskimo dialect between 1961 and 1970, number laid off in 1969-70 and 1970-71: Mr. Yewchuk—presented forthwith, 396. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/351.
3. Television programs sold to U.S. networks but refused to Windsor station, referring to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee: motion (Mr. MacGuigan), moved and debate interrupted, 506.

Canadian Business Records Protection Act:

Bill C-131, Mr. Mather. 1st R, 26.

Canadian Citizenship Act amendment:

1. Bill C-18, Mr. Allmand (Oath of Allegiance). 1st R, 23. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 300.
2. Bill C-66, Mr. Allmand. 1st R, 24.
3. Bill C-95, Mr. Peters (Freedom of Conscience). 1st R, 25.
4. Bill C-103, Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) (Time off without Loss of Pay for Appearance in Citizenship Court). 1st R, 25.
5. Bill C-165, Mr. Prud'homme (Minimum Residence Requirement). 1st R, 39.

Canadian Commercial Corporation:

1. Report for 1971-72, with auditor's report, 501. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/88.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 16 to *Journals*, 303.

Canadian Council on Social Development:

Order,—Return re government contributions toward permanent programs for transient youth, costs, etc.: Mr. Schumacher—presented forthwith, 499. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/171.

Canadian Dairy Commission:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Agriculture Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 21 to *Journals*, 331.

Canadian Flag Day Act:

Bill C-132, Mr. Haidasz. 1st R, 26.

Canadian Forces Superannuation Account:

Statement on standing and transactions of account as at Mar. 31, 1972, 419-20. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/92.

Canadian International Development Agency:

1. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to External Affairs and National Defence Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 15 to *Journals*, 300.
2. Order,—Return re shipments of international emergency relief in 1971, transportation arrangements: Mr. McCleave—presented forthwith, 36. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/70.

Canadian Livestock Feed Board:

1. Report for crop year ended July 31, 1971, 236. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/94.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Agriculture Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 21 to *Journals*, 331.

Canadian National Railways:

1. Annual report for 1971, 291. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/96.
2. Auditor's report for 1971, 292. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/97.
3. Securities trust report for 1971, 292. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/101.
4. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 22 to *Journals*, 335.
5. Rail passenger service in Newfoundland, rescinding order of Canadian Transport Commission authorizing discontinuance: motion (Mr. McGrath), moved and debate interrupted, 224.

Canadian National Railways - (Concluded)

6. Report re branch line from mile 17 of Windfall Extension to Sangudo Subdivision to Bigstone, Alberta, 239. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/99C.
7. Order,—Correspondence with Minister of Transport re recommendations of Transport Committee on CNR pension plan: Mr. Skoberg; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 258.
8. Order,—Correspondence between Transport Minister and President of CNR re Transport Committee recommendations on CNR pension plan: Mr. Skoberg; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 258.
9. Financial statement for 1971 re branch line from Grimshaw, Alta. to Great Slave Lake, N.W.T., 264. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/99D.

Canadian National Railways Financing and Guarantee Act:

Bill C-4, Minister of Finance—To authorize capital expenditures in 1971-72, supply financial requirements of Air Canada, and issue of securities. 1st R, 11-2. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 43-4. Debate resumed and interrupted, 50, 51-2. Debate resumed, amendment (Mr. Thomson),—"This day six months hence", moved and debate interrupted, 62. Debate resumed and interrupted, 249.

Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation:

1. Report for 1971-72, with auditor's report, 493. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/102.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 22 to *Journals*, 335.

Canadian Patents and Development Corporation:

Report for 1971-72, with auditor's report, 464. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/104.

Canadian Radio-Television Commission:

1. Report for 1971-72, 493. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/286.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee, 29. Reported, with recommendations re decision on Mississauga cablevision, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 17 to *Journals*, 303-4.

Canadian Status Act:

Bill C-134, Mr. Downey. 1st R, 26.

Canadian Transport Commission:

1. Report for 1971, 209. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/105.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 22 to *Journals*, 335.

Canadian Wheat Board:

1. Report for crop year ending July 31, 1971, certified by auditors, 239. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/259.
2. Motion,—That annual and supplementary reports for 1968-69, 1969-70 and 1970-71 be referred to Agriculture Committee: Notice called and transferred to Government Orders, 352.
3. Ordered, by unanimous consent,—That supplementary reports for 1968-69, 1969-70 and annual report for 1970-71 be referred to Agriculture Committee, 401.

Canadian Wheat Board Act amendment:

1. Bill C-204, Minister of Justice—To determine payments; to extend application of the Act to flaxseed, rapeseed and rye. 1st R, 281. Report stage, 355, 421-3. Motions to amend; agreed to, 422, negatived on recorded division, 422-3. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 423. 3rd R agreed to, 423. Passed by Senate, 491. R.A., 492. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 16, S.C. 1972.
2. Motion,—That when said Bill is introduced it shall stand for consideration at report stage, agreed to, 281.

Cancer Foundation Act:

See **Canada Cancer Foundation Act.**

Cape Breton Development Corporation:

1. Report for 1971, 239. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/106.
2. Capital budget for 1972, 63. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/107.
3. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Regional Development Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 25 to *Journals*, 347.

Census:

Order,—Return re commissioners and representatives hired for 1971 census in Abitibi constituency, salaries: Mr. Laprise—presented forthwith, 327. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/372.

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation:

1. Report, together with statement certified by auditors, for 1971, 218-9. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/108.
2. Revised capital budget for 1971, 66. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/109.
3. Capital budget for 1972, 239. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/109A.
4. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 19 to *Journals*, 311.
5. Order,—Leases, agreements, etc. in possession of CMHC since commencement of negotiations between developers and CNR re Main Square in Toronto; Mr. Ryan; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 284.

Certification of Masters Act:

Bill C-192, Mr. Groos. 1st R, 247.

Chairman of Committees of the Whole House:

See *Committees of the Whole House*.

Chief Electoral Officer:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 2 to *Journals*, 65.

Children:

See *Criminal Code amendment*; *Family Income Security Plan Act amendment*; *Foster Grandparents of Canada Act*.

Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act:

See *War Pensions and Allowances Acts amendment*.

Cigarette Tar and Nicotine Content Act:

Bill C-125, Mr. Robinson. 1st R, 26.

Cigarettes:

See *Broadcasting Act amendment*; *Food and Drugs Act amendment*; *Tobacco Health Hazard Act*; *Tobacco Restraint Act*.

Civil Service Insurance Act:

Statement on operations for 1971-72, 390. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/110.

Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act:

See *War Pensions and Allowances Acts amendment*.

Clerk of Petitions:

1. Reports on Petitions for Private Bills, 14.
2. Reports on Public Petitions, 35, 251, 361, 385, 426.

Clerk of the House:

Tables Private Bills, 35.

Combines Investigation Act amendment:

Bill C-13, Mr. Orlikow (Floor Penalties, Criminal Joint Tortfeasors, and Moieties). 1st R, 23. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 256.

Commissioner of Official Languages:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 16 to *Journals*, 303.

Committees of the Whole House:

1. Deputy Chairman, Gerald Laniel, Esq., M.P., appointed on motion, 6.
2. Assistant Deputy Chairman, Prosper Boulanger, Esq., M.P., appointed on motion, 6.

Communications Department:

1. Report for 1970-71, 40. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/22.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 22 to *Journals*, 335.

Commuter Passenger Train Authority (Ontario) Act:

Bill C-24, Mr. Roberts. 1st R, 24.

Company of Young Canadians:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee, 29.

Conservation Day Act:

Bill C-151, Mr. Sulatycky. 1st R, 26.

Constitution of Canada (Joint) Committee:

1. Motion,—To appoint to examine and report upon proposals, made public by the Government of Canada, on subjects related to the Constitution of Canada and evidence adduced in the previous two sessions and that a message be sent to the Senate, agreed to without debate, 33-4. Message from Senate, 40.
2. House membership, 34.
3. Senate membership, 40.
4. Reports: Final (Constitution of Canada, with recommendations) (Appendix 4 to *Journals*), 67-193.

Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee, 30.

Consumption Date of Packaged Perishable Food Act:

Bill C-34, Mr. Mather. 1st R, 24.

Continental Shelf Act:

Bill C-111, Mr. McGrath. 1st R, 25.

Copper:

1. Telex, dated Mar. 27, 1972, from Energy, Mines and Resources Minister to producers, 227. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/4.
2. Telex from Energy, Mines and Resources Minister to exporters to Japan, 265. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/4A.

Copyright Act amendment:

Bill C-229, Mr. Rose. 1st R, 487.

Corporal Punishment:

See *Criminal Code amendment; Criminal Law Amendment Act.*

Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act:

Report for 1969, Part I—Corporations, 44. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/115.

Correctional Services:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 11 to *Journals*, 283.

Crime:

Order,—Return re murders committed since 1960, peace officers killed on duty since 1967, sentences reduced, etc.: Mr. Forest—presented forthwith, 442. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/254.

Criminal Code amendment:

1. Bill C-9, Mr. MacDonald (Egmont) (Abolition of Corporal Punishment). 1st R, 23. Order for second reading discharged and bill withdrawn, 300.
2. Bill C-20, Mr. Watson (Attempt to Commit Suicide). 1st R, 24.
3. Bill C-32, Mr. Anderson (Pollution). 1st R, 24.
4. Bill C-35, Mr. Orlikow (Preventive Detention). 1st R, 24.
5. Bill C-36, Mr. Allmand (Control of Weapons and Firearms). 1st R, 24.
6. Bill C-37, Mr. Robinson (Air Piracy). 1st R, 24.
7. Bill C-43, Mr. Robinson (Vagrancy). 1st R, 24.
8. Bill C-51, Mr. Woolliams (Air Piracy). 1st R, 24.
9. Bill C-60, Mr. Mather (Alteration of Odometer). 1st R, 24.
10. Bill C-62, Mr. Orlikow (Company-censored Housing). 1st R, 24.
11. Bill C-67, Mr. Stewart (Cochrane) (Disturbance in Parliament). 1st R, 24.
12. Bill C-76, Mrs. MacInnis (Abortion). 1st R, 25.
13. Bill C-83, Mr. Orlikow (Wiretapping). 1st R, 25.
14. Bill C-113, Mr. Mather (Cruelty to Animals). 1st R, 25.
15. Bill C-120, Mr. Southam (Battered Child). 1st R, 26.
16. Bill C-135, Mr. Woolliams (Young Offenders). 1st R, 26.
17. Bill C-137, Mr. Allmand (Air and Water Pollution). 1st R, 26.
18. Bill C-139, Mr. Caouette (Kidnapping). 1st R, 26.
19. Bill C-142, Mr. Mather (Obliteration of Motor Vehicle Serial Numbers). 1st R, 26.
20. Bill C-143, Mr. Allmand (Adjournment for Accused to Obtain Legal Representation). 1st R, 26.
21. Bill C-144, Mr. Forrestall (Attempted Suicide). 1st R, 26.
22. Bill C-155, Mr. Robinson (Attempted Suicide). 1st R, 26.
23. Bill C-197, Mr. Hopkins (Canadian and Provincial Flags). 1st R, 267.
24. Bill C-198, Mr. Hopkins (Foreign Flags). 1st R, 267.
25. Bill C-225, Minister of Justice (Off-track Betting). 1st R, 441.

Criminal Law Amendment Act:

Bill C-2, Minister of Justice. 1st R, 11. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 263. Debate resumed and interrupted, 265, 268. Debate resumed and 2nd R agreed to, referred to Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, 269. Reported with amendments, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 13 to *Journals*, 289-90. Report stage, motion to amend agreed to, motion for concurrence agreed to, 320. 3rd R moved, amendment (Mr. Rondeau),—To defer and refer back to committee, moved and debate interrupted, 302. Debate resumed, amendment negatived on recorded division, 3rd R agreed to, 304-6. Passed by Senate, 383. R.A., 386. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 13, S.C. 1972.

Criminal Records Act:

See **Criminal Law Amendment Act**.

Criminal Records Act amendment:

1. Bill C-22, Mr. Robinson. 1st R, 24.
2. Bill C-205, Mr. Rynard (Young Offenders). 1st R, 281.

Crop Insurance Act:

Order,—Return re enabling legislation passed by provinces, indemnities paid, crops covered, federal share of costs: Mr. Southam—presented forthwith, 201. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/241.

Crown Assets Disposal Corporation:

Report for 1971-72, with auditor's report, 493. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/117.

Crown Corporations:

Order,—Return re use of accounting firms to audit accounts, names, costs: Mr. Ryan—presented forthwith, 237. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/10.

Crown Corporations Act:

Bill C-54, Mr. Stewart (Cochrane) (Members of Parliament as Directors). 1st R, 24.

Crown Liability Act:

See **Protection of Privacy Act**.

Custodian of Enemy Property:

Report for 1971, 233. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/118.

Customs Tariff Act amendment:

Ways and Means motion tabled May 8, 1972 agreed to, 429. Bill C-224, Minister of Finance. 1st R, 429.

D**Dairy Commission:**

See **Canadian Dairy Commission**.

Dairy Farming:

Order,—Return re feasibility study of 1967-68 as mentioned in answer to Question No. 1323 (p. 10597, *Hansard* of 1968-69 session): Mr. Skoberg; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 258.

Data Privacy Act:

Bill C-75, Mr. Goode. 1st R, 25.

Defence:

Order,—That White Paper entitled "Defence in the 70s", tabled Sept. 7, 1971, be referred to External Affairs and National Defence Committee, 21. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 36 to *Journals*, 448-63.

Defence Construction (1951) Limited:

1. Report for 1971-72, with auditor's report, 464. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/120.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to External Affairs and National Defence Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 15 to *Journals*, 300.

Defence Equipment:

Order,—Return re commodities purchased from Canada between 1965 and 1970 by certain countries, resale: Mr. MacDonald (Egmont)—presented forthwith, 36. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/155.

Defence Forces:

See **Canadian Armed Forces**.

Deposit Insurance Corporation:

See **Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation**.

Designated Areas:

See **Regional Development**.

Designation of the Speaker of the House of Commons as Member of Parliament for Parliament Hill:

Bill C-101, Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre). 1st R, 25.

Detergents Labelling Act:

Bill C-147, Mrs. MacInnis. 1st R, 26.

Disabled Persons Act:

Report on administration of allowances for 1970-71, 383. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/121.

Disabled Persons' Transportation Act:

Bill C-138, Mr. Nesbitt. 1st R, 26.

Disclosure of Financial Interests Act:

Bill C-91, Mr. Roberts. 1st R, 25.

Disclosure of Interests Act:

Bill C-38, Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre). 1st R, 24.

Divisions, Recorded:

1. Subamendment (Mr. Lewis) to Motion for Address in Reply, negated (Yeas 59, Nays 115), 13-4.
2. Subamendment (Mr. Caouette) to Motion for Address in Reply, negated (Yeas 84, Nays 122), 18-9.
3. Amendment (Mr. Stanfield) to Motion for Address in Reply, negated (Yeas 86, Nays 120), 19.
4. Amendment (Mr. Alexander) to Motion for Address in Reply, negated (Yeas 72, Nays 111), 31-2.
5. Amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre) to Supply Motion, negated (Yeas 79, Nays 114), 46.
6. Motion (Mr. Baldwin) under S.O. 58, negated (Yeas 79, Nays 114), 47.
7. Amendment (Mr. Broadbent) to defer 3rd R of Bill C-169 (Income Tax Act amendment) and refer back to Committee of the Whole, negated (Yeas 20, Nays 88), 203.
8. Amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre) to Supply Motion, negated (Yeas 63, Nays 94), 212.
9. Motion (Mr. Rynard) under S.O. 58, negated (Yeas 62, Nays 94), 213.
10. Motion (Mr. O'Connell) for 2nd R of Bill C-183 (Canada Labour Code Act amendment), agreed to (Yeas 187, Nays 2), 241-2.
11. Amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre) to Supply Motion, negated (Yeas 70, Nays 109), 252.
12. Motion (Mr. Stanfield) under S.O. 58, negated (Yeas 78, Nays 109), 252.
13. Amendment (Mr. Lewis) to decline 2nd R of Bill C-170 (Family Income Security Plan Act) and increase allowances through other legislation, negated (Yeas 66, Nays 93), 262.
14. Motion (Mr. Munro) for 2nd R of Bill C-170 (Family Income Security Plan Act), agreed to (Yeas 135, Nays 22), 262-3.
15. Subamendment (Mr. Knight) to motion for 2nd R of Bill C-5 (Farm Credit Act amendment), negated (Yeas 21, Nays 171), 285.
16. Amendment (Mr. Korchinski) to decline 2nd R of Bill C-5 (Farm Credit Act amendment) and consider legislation incorporating the incentive principle regarding interest rates, negated (Yeas 63, Nays 129), 286.
17. Motion (Mr. Olson) for 2nd R of Bill C-5 (Farm Credit Act amendment), agreed to (Yeas 191, Nays nil), 287.
18. Subamendment (Mr. Saltsman) to Ways and Means Motion (Budget), negated (Yeas 31, Nays 158), 296-7.
19. Amendment (Mr. Rondeau) to defer 3rd R of Bill C-2 (Criminal Law Amendment Act) and refer back to Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, negated (Yeas 11, Nays 187), 305-6.
20. Amendment (Mr. Lambert, Edmonton West) to Ways and Means Motion (Budget), negated (Yeas 75, Nays 113), 328.
21. Motion (Mr. Yewchuk) to adjourn debate on motion for 2nd R of Bill C-211 (Election Expenses Act), negated (Yeas 45, Nays 114), 332.
22. Amendment (Mr. Woolliams) to Supply Motion, negated (Yeas 56, Nays 97), 349.
23. Motion (Mrs. MacInnis) under S.O. 58, negated (Yeas 49, Nays 99), 349-50.
24. Motion (Mr. Pepin) for 2nd R of Bill C-201 (Foreign Takeovers Review Act), agreed to (Yeas 144, Nays 29), 358.
25. Amendment (Mr. Peters) to supersede motion for 2nd R of Bill C-211 (Election Expenses Act) by "six months' hoist", negated (Yeas 71, Nays 85), 363-4.
26. Motion (Mr. Fortin) to proceed to Orders of the Day, negated (Yeas 11, Nays 147), 371.
27. Motion (Mr. MacEachen) to adjourn debate on motion under S.O. 43, agreed to (Yeas 85, Nays 49), 372.
28. Motion (Mr. Peters) that this House do now adjourn, negated (Yeas 45, Nays 71), 372-3.

Divisions, Recorded – (Concluded)

29. Motion (Mr. Turner, Ottawa-Carleton) for Ways and Means (Budget), agreed to (Yeas 112, Nays 83), 379-80.
30. Motion (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in Vote 1, Communications Department, Main Estimates, 1972-73, agreed to (Yeas 113, Nays 71), 402-3.
31. Motion (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in Vote 10, Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department, Main Estimates, 1972-73, agreed to (Yeas 113, Nays 70), 403-4.
32. Motion (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in Vote 25, Prices and Incomes Commission, Main Estimates, 1972-73, agreed to (Yeas 112, Nays 66), 404-5.
33. Motion (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in Vote 1, Energy, Mines and Resources Department, Main Estimates, 1972-73, agreed to (Yeas 112, Nays 65), 405.
34. Motion (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in Vote 5, Energy, Mines and Resources Department, Main Estimates, 1972-73, agreed to (Yeas 112, Nays 64), 406.
35. Motion (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in Vote 15, Energy, Mines and Resources Department, Main Estimates, 1972-73, agreed to (Yeas 111, Nays 66), 407.
36. Motion (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in Vote 1, Environment Department, Main Estimates, 1972-73, agreed to (Yeas 109, Nays 65), 407-8.
37. Motion (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in Vote 1, External Affairs Department, Main Estimates, 1972-73, agreed to (Yeas 107, Nays 60), 408-9.
38. Motion (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in Vote 25, Canadian International Development Agency, Main Estimates, 1972-73, agreed to (Yeas 110, Nays 64), 409-10.
39. Motion (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in Vote 5, National Defence Department, Main Estimates, 1972-73, agreed to (Yeas 141, Nays 23), 412.
40. Motion (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in Vote 1, Senate, Main Estimates, 1972-73, agreed to (Yeas 141, Nays 26), 414.
41. Motion (Mr. Drury) for concurrence in Vote 5, Information Canada, Main Estimates, 1972-73, agreed to (Yeas 107, Nays 58), 417-8.
42. Motion (Mr. Gleave) at report stage to amend Bill C-204 (Canadian Wheat Board Act amendment), negatived (Yeas 18, Nays 84), 423.
43. Motion (Mr. Marshall) at report stage to amend Bill C-170 (Family Income Security Plan Act), negatived (Yeas 77, Nays 110), 436.
44. Motion (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre) at report stage to amend Bill C-170 (Family Income Security Plan Act), negatived (Yeas 27, Nays 159), 437.
45. Motion (Mr. Mazankowski) at report stage to amend Bill C-5 (Farm Credit Act amendment), negatived (Yeas 69, Nays 99), 444-5.
46. Motion (Mr. Rose) at report stage to amend Bill C-183 (Canada Labour Code Act amendment), negatived (Yeas 51, Nays 94), 489.
47. Motion (Mr. Alexander) at report stage to amend Bill C-183 (Canada Labour Code Act amendment), negatived (Yeas 36, Nays 111), 490.
48. Motion (Mr. Alexander) at report stage to amend Bill C-183 (Canada Labour Code Act amendment), negatived (Yeas 36, Nays 111), 490-1.
49. Amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre) to defer 3rd R of Bill C-170 (Family Income Security Plan Act) and refer back to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee to reconsider clauses on means and income tests, negatived (Yeas 35, Nays 56), 505-6.

Divorce Act amendment:

Bill C-69, Mr. McCleave. 1st R, 24.

Dominion Day:

See **Canada Day Act**.

Drug Addicts Disclosure Act:

Bill C-72, Mr. Haidasz. 1st R, 25.

Drugs, Narcotic:

1. Report of Commission of Inquiry (Le Dain) into non-medical use of drugs—(Cannabis), 304. Sess. Paper No. 284-4/105.
2. Order,—Reports, etc. by Health and Welfare Department re use of marijuana: Mr. McIntosh; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 443.

E

Economic Conditions:

Document entitled "Economic Review, April 1972", 255. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/315.

Economic Council of Canada:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 23 to *Journals*, 341.

Education:

Convening national conference on uniform standards at primary and secondary levels: motion (Mr. Lundrigan), moved and debate interrupted, 430.

Eldorado Aviation Limited:

1. Report for 1971, with auditor's report, 248. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/129.
2. Capital budget for 1972, 53. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/130.

Eldorado Nuclear Limited:

1. Report for 1971, with auditor's report, 248. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/129.
2. Capital budget for 1972, 53. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/130.
3. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to National Resources and Public Works Committee, 30.

Election Expenses Act:

Bill C-211, President of the Privy Council—To make amendments in respect of election expenses. 1st R, 300. 2nd R moved, amendment (Mr. Macquarrie),—To decline due to lack of reform, a point of order having arisen further consideration was deferred, 312. Debate resumed, amendment ruled out of order, 315-7. Debate resumed and interrupted, 317. Debate resumed; motion to adjourn debate, negatived on recorded division, 331-2. Debate resumed; amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre),—To decline and introduce legislation to provide effective control over election expenses, ruled out of order, 332-4. Debate resumed and interrupted, 334. Debate resumed; amendment (Mr. Peters),—"This day six months hence", negatived on recorded division, 363-4. 2nd R agreed to on division, referred to Privileges and Elections Committee, 364.

Elections:

Warrant for issue of new writ for by-election: Esquimalt-Saanich vacancy, 507.
See also **Conodo Elections Act** amendment.

Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment:

1. Bill C-50, Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West) (Representation Commissioner). 1st R, 24.
2. Bill C-55, Mr. Whelan (Essex-Windsor). 1st R, 24. 2nd R, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment and concurred in, 3rd R, by unanimous consent, 62. Passed by Senate, 208. R.A., 232. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 3, S.C. 1972.
3. Bill C-74, Mr. Deakon (High Park-Humber Valley). 1st R, 25. 2nd R, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment and concurred in, 3rd R, by unanimous consent, 62. Passed by Senate, 208. R.A., 232. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 4, S.C. 1972.
4. Bill C-92, Mr. Hopkins (Renfrew North-Nipissing East). 1st R, 25. 2nd R, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment and concurred in, 3rd R, by unanimous consent, 62. Passed by Senate, 208. R.A., 232. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 5, S.C. 1972.
5. Bill C-167, Mr. Lajoie (Metropolitan Trois Rivières). 1st R, 45. 2nd R, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported with amendment, concurred in as amended, 3rd R, by unanimous consent, 62. Passed by Senate, 208. R.A., 232. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 7, S.C. 1972.
6. Bill C-172, Mr. Gendron (Rivière du Loup-Témiscouata). 1st R, 199. 2nd R after debate, considered in Committee of the Whole by unanimous consent, reported without amendment, concurred in at report stage, 3rd R, 228. Passed by Senate, 232. R.A., 232. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 6, S.C. 1972.
7. Bill C-212, Mr. Reid (Rules). 1st R, 304.

Employment:

1. Letters, dated Nov. 5 to Nov. 12, 1971 re grant under Local Initiatives Program to The Process—Church of the Final Judgement, 51. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/3.
2. Order,—Return re loans to provinces since 1969 for winter works programs, terms of payment: Mr. Dinsdale—presented forthwith, 237. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/167.
3. Order,—Return re federal-provincial employment loans program, projects approved for B.C., costs: Mr. Stewart (Okanagan Boundary)—presented forthwith, 238. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/335.
4. Letter, dated Apr. 21, 1972, by Prime Minister to certain provincial premiers re manpower programs, 261. Sess. Paper No. 284-5/43.
5. Order,—Return re projects approved or rejected in Abitibi constituency under Local Initiatives Program: Mr. Laprise—presented forthwith, 267. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/256.
6. Order,—Return re grants under Local Initiatives Program, in each province, each Quebec constituency and Richmond constituency, jobs created: Mr. Beaudoin—presented forthwith, 272. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/379.
7. Order,—Return re Local Initiatives Program in Lotbiniere constituency, funds invested, groups which benefited: Mr. Fortin—presented forthwith, 353. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/489.
8. Order,—Return re Local Initiatives Program in Beauce constituency, funds invested, groups which benefited: Mr. Rodrigue—presented forthwith, 378. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/499.
9. Order,—Return re projects submitted under Local Initiatives Program in Champlain constituency, grants requested, projects approved, etc.: Mr. Matte—presented forthwith, 396. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/445.

Employment Support Board:

1. Report for quarter ended Dec. 31, 1971, 10. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/180.
2. Report for quarter ended Mar. 31, 1972, 268. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/180A.

Enemy Property:

See **Custodian of Enemy Property.**

Energy Board:

See **National Energy Board.**

Energy, Mines and Resources Department:

1. Report for 1970-71, 492. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/9.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to National Resources and Public Works Committee, 30. (Deemed reported—Issues 1, 2 and 5 of Committee Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence).
3. Order,—Report by Operations Research Industries Limited re policy and planning branch as mentioned in answer to Question No. 2452 (p. 11709, *Hansard* of 1968-69 session): Mr. Skoberg; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 327.

Environment Department:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Fisheries and Forestry Committee, 30. (Deemed reported—Issues 1 to 9 of Committee Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence).

Environment Department Act amendment:

Bill C-40, Mr. McGrath (Fisheries). 1st R, 24.

Environmental Council of Canada Act:

Bill C-12, Mr. Goode. 1st R, 23. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 438.

Essex constituency, change of name:

See **Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment.**

Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act:

See **Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act.**

Estimates:

1. Main Estimates, 1972-73, tabled, 17. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/132.
2. Supplementary Estimates (B), 1971-72, tabled, 45. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/132A.

Estimates – (Concluded)

3. Referred to Standing Committees, 29-31, 45.
See also **Supply Motions**.

Examiner of Petitions:

Reports, 37.

Excessive Outdoor Noises Act:

Bill C-161, Mr. Badanai. 1st R, 33.

Exchange Fund Account:

Report on operations together with financial statement for 1971, 345. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/133.

Excise Tax Act amendment:

Ways and Means motion tabled May 8, 1972 agreed to, 429. Bill C-223, Minister of Finance. 1st R, 429.

Exhibition Assistance Act:

Bill C-214, Minister of Agriculture—To develop community facilities for agricultural and fishery exhibitions; to provide for loans to exhibition commissions, etc. 1st R, 282.

Explosives Act amendment:

Bill C-7, Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. 1st R, 12. 2nd R moved; amendment (Mr. Downey),—To affirm a certain principle and refer subject-matter to Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, ruled out of order, 208. Debate resumed and interrupted, 208.

Export and Import Permits Act:

Report of operations for 1971, 233. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/137.

Export Credits Insurance Act:

Report on operations under Part II for 1971-72, 236. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/139.

Export Development Corporation:

Report for 1971, 272. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/289.

Exportation of the Growth and Produce of Canada Act:

Bill C-79, Mr. Peters. 1st R, 25.

External Affairs:

1. World centre for co-ordination, etc. of international relations, natural resources and environment, establishing: motion (Mr. MacDonald, Egmont), moved and debate interrupted, 268.
2. Order,—Return re memberships in Latin American organizations, costs and benefits: Mr. Robinson—presented forthwith, 353. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/345.
3. Order,—Return re diplomatic missions abroad, countries not reciprocating, plans for mission to Bangladesh: Mr. Macquarrie—presented forthwith, 362. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/429.
4. Order,—Return re diplomatic relations with certain states, embassies and consulates, costs, officers, etc.: Mr. Blackburn—presented forthwith, 442. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/519.

External Affairs and National Defence Committee:

1. Membership, 20, 22, 44, 50, 204, 214, 218, 228, 233, 246, 248, 302, 334, 342, 438.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Canadian International Development Agency, Defence Construction (1951) Limited, External Affairs Department, International Joint Commission, National Defence Department, 29.
3. Referred: White Paper entitled “Defence in the 70s”, 21.
4. Reports: First (adjournment from place to place), 299-300; Second (Canadian International Development Agency, Defence Construction (1951) Limited, External Affairs, International Joint Commission, National Defence, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 15 to *Journals*), 300; Third (White Paper entitled “Defence in the 70s”) (Appendix 36 to *Journals*), 448-63.
5. Reports concurred in: First, on notice without debate, 319.

External Affairs Department:

1. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to External Affairs and National Defence Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 15 to *Journals*, 300.
2. Order,—Interim Report of March, 1968, by Dr. Vennema, Director of Canadian Medical Aid in Viet Nam, and subsequent correspondence: Mrs. MacInnis; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 49. Moved and debate interrupted, 448.

External Aid:

Order,—Return re contributions to World Food Program since its inception, controls over spending, criteria: Mr. Robinson—presented forthwith, 251. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/303.

F**Fair Credit Reporting Act:**

Bill C-104, Mr. McGrath. 1st R, 25.

Family Allowances:

1. Letter, dated Mar. 9, 1972, from Prime Minister to Quebec premier re family allowances, manpower centres and adult occupational training, 59. Sess. Paper No. 284-5/155.
2. Letter, dated Mar. 9, 1972, from Prime Minister to provincial premiers re family allowances, manpower centres and adult occupational training, 59. Sess. Paper No. 284-5/52.

Family Allowances Act (Repeal):

See **Family Income Security Plan Act**.

Family Income Security Plan Act:

Bill C-170, Minister of National Health and Welfare—To provide for calculation and payment of benefits for children; to amend the War Veterans Act and repeal the Family Allowances Act and Youth Allowances Act. 1st R, 65. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 218. Debate resumed and interrupted, 224, 228, 242. Debate resumed; amendment (Mr. Lewis),—To defer 2nd R and increase allowances through other legislation, moved and debate interrupted, 246. Debate resumed and interrupted, 247-8, 255-6, 258. Debate resumed, amendment negated on recorded division, 261-2. 2nd R agreed to, on recorded division, referred to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee, 262-3. Reported with amendment, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 27 to *Journals*, 351. Report stage; motions to amend, agreed to, 433-4; agreed to on division, 435; negated on division, 433-4; negated on recorded division, 436-7; ruled out of order, 434; withdrawn, 434. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 437. 3rd R moved and debate interrupted, 447. Debate resumed; amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre),—To defer and refer back to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee, moved and debate adjourned on motion, 463. Debate resumed and interrupted, 504. Debate resumed, amendment negated on recorded division, 505-6.

Farm Credit Act amendment:

Bill C-5, Minister of Agriculture—To increase the capital of the Farm Credit Corporation, and to establish loan procedures. 1st R, 12. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 269. Debate resumed, amendment (Mr. Korchinski),—To decline second reading and consider legislation incorporating the incentive principle regarding interest rates, moved and debate interrupted, 272. Debate resumed, subamendment (Mr. Knight),—To delete certain words and add others, moved and debate interrupted, 275-6. Debate resumed and adjourned, 280, 281-2. Debate resumed; subamendment negated on recorded division, 284-5, amendment negated on recorded division, 286, 2nd R agreed to, on recorded division, referred to Agriculture Committee, 287. Reported without amendment, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 33 to *Journals*, 421. Report stage, 438, 443-5. Motions to amend, negated on recorded division, 444-5; ruled out of order, 444. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 445. 3rd R after debate, 463. Passed by Senate, 506. R.A., 506. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 19, S.C. 1972.

Farm Credit Corporation:

1. Report for 1971-72, with auditor's report, 439. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/142.
2. Capital budget for 1972-73, 63. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/143.
3. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Agriculture Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 21 to *Journals*, 331.

Farm Improvement Loans Act:

Report for 1971, 364. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/144.

Farmers:

Order,—Return re income tax returns filed between 1966 and 1970 by province, incomes listed, taxes collected: Mr. Mazankowski—presented forthwith, 362. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/550.

Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act:

Report on administration for 1971-72, 239. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/145.

Farms:

Order,—Report, with related papers, of technical committee established by Agriculture Minister re small farms: Mr. MacDonald (Egmont); order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 258.

Federal Court of Canada:

1. Amending Order No. 1 amending the rules, 22. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/404A.
2. General Rules and Orders, with Order in Council approving same, 22. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/404.

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act:

1. Bill C-8, Minister of Finance—To provide for payment of provinces out of Consolidated Revenue Fund until March, 1977; to authorize tax collection agreements, etc. 1st R, 12. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 36-7. Debate resumed and interrupted, 39-40. Debate resumed, 2nd R agreed to, referred to Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, 41. Reported without amendment, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 1 to *Journals*, 61. Report stage, 195-6. Motions to amend, withdrawn, 196. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 196. 3rd R moved; amendment (Mr. McCleave),—To defer and resolve that the action of the government is without constitutional authority, ruled out of order, 196-7. Debate resumed and interrupted, 197. Debate resumed, 3rd R agreed to, 202. Passed by Senate, 214. R.A., 232. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 8, S.C. 1972.
2. Tables showing post-secondary education expenditures, transfer payments, tax abatement and equalization payments, and adjustment payments under the Act, 36-7. Sess. Paper No. 284-5/51. (*Printed as appendix to Hansard of Mar. 1, 1972*).

Federal-Provincial Relations:

See Supply Motions.

Federal Transport Commission of Inquiry Act:

Bill C-85, Mr. Forrestall. 1st R, 25.

Fertilizer:

Order,—Return re tenders for chemical fertilizers since January, 1970 for federal Experimental Farm Stations: Mr. Beaudoin—presented forthwith, 268. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/378.

Film Board:

See National Film Board.

Finance:

Order,—Correspondence, etc. re adverse effects of change to floating dollar announced in June, 1970: Mr. Burton; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 284. See also Supply Motions.

Finance Department:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 23 to *Journals*, 341.

Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee:

1. Membership, 34, 37, 47-8, 50, 52, 56, 62, 199, 204, 214, 228-9, 239, 243, 282, 302, 342, 364, 373, 375, 378, 380, 383, 392-3, 397, 419, 431.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Economic Council of Canada, Finance Department, Industry, Trade and Commerce Department, Insurance Department, National Revenue Department, Standards Council of Canada, Statistics Canada, Tariff Board, 29-30.
3. Bills referred: United Bank of Canada Act, 39-40; Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, 41; Foreign Takeovers Review Act, 358-9.
4. Reports: First (Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act) (Appendix 1 to *Journals*), 61; Second (United Bank of Canada Act) (Appendix 3 to *Journals*), 67; Third (Economic Council of Canada, Finance, Industry, Trade and Commerce, Insurance, National Revenue, Standards Council of Canada, Statistics Canada, Tariff Board, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 23 to *Journals*), 341; Fourth (Foreign Takeovers Review Act, with amendments) (Appendix 32 to *Journals*), 399-401.

Financial Administration Act amendment:

1. Bill C-86, Mr. Thompson (Red Deer) (Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration). 1st R, 25.
2. Bill C-141, Mr. Hales (Public Accounts). 1st R, 26.

Fisheries:

Motion (Mr. Fairweather),—House calls on representatives at International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries meeting to ensure survival of Atlantic salmon, agreed to after debate, 255.

Fisheries Act amendment:

Bill C-41, Mr. Barnett (Licensing). 1st R, 24.

Fisheries and Forestry Committee:

1. Membership, 41, 47, 60, 62, 204, 214, 225, 248, 264, 276.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Environment Department, 30.

Fisheries and Forestry Department:

Report for 1970-71, 204. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/11.

Fisheries Improvement Loans Act:

Report for 1971-72, 439. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/147.

Flags:

See **Canadian Flag Day Act; Criminal Code amendment.**

Food and Agriculture Organization:

Report on activities for 1971-72, 508. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/3.

Food and Drugs Act amendment:

1. Bill C-58, Mr. Mather (Tobacco Products). 1st R, 24.
2. Bill C-77, Mr. Anderson (Labelling). 1st R, 25.
3. Bill C-116, Mr. MacDonald (Egmont) (Labelling of Dates on Perishable Commodities). 1st R, 25.
4. Bill C-190, Mr. Mather (Cigarette Advertising). 1st R, 245.

Food Prices:

See **Supply Motions.**

Footwear Industry:

Report, dated January, 1972, entitled "A Study of Marketing in the Canadian Footwear Industry" Volumes 1, 2 and 3, 21. Sess. Paper No. 284-4/47.

Foreign Takeovers Review Act:

Bill C-201, Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce—To provide for review of acquisitions of control of businesses; to provide for a Registrar and investigations, etc. 1st R, 275. 2nd R moved; amendment (Mr. Fairweather),—To decline and introduce more comprehensive legislation, ruled out of order, 337-8. Debate resumed and interrupted, 338, 341-2, 344. Debate resumed; amendment (Mr. Saltsman),—To defer and introduce legislation to cover established foreign-owned corporations, ruled out of order, 354. Debate resumed and interrupted, 354-5. Debate resumed, 2nd R agreed to on recorded division, referred to Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, 358-9. Reported with amendments, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 32 to *Journals*, 399-401. Report stage, 426, 429-31, 495-7, 500.

Foreign Vessels Construction Standards Act:

Bill C-193, Mr. Groos. 1st R, 247.

Foster Grandparents of Canada Act:

Bill C-119, Mr. Ryan. 1st R, 26.

G**Geoffroy, Yves:**

1. Correspondence re leave of absence from penitentiary, 16. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/1.
2. Order,—Documents, etc. re release from St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: Mr. Woolliams; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 49.

Government Boards and Agencies:

Order,—Return re name changes since June 25, 1968, costs: Mr. Coates—presented forthwith, 382. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/133.

Government Contracts Employment Act amendment:

Bill C-19, Mr. Orlikow. 1st R, 24. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 341-2.

Government Contracts, Purchases, Properties, etc.:

1. Order,—Return re contracts awarded for file folders between Feb. 1 and 15, tenders called and amounts: Mr. McQuaid—presented forthwith, 238. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/324.
2. Order,—Return re purchase of certain office equipment and furnishings in past three years: Mr. Harding—presented forthwith, 326. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/160.
3. Order,—Return re plans for expansion of office space in Dartmouth-Halifax constituency in next three years, costs: Mr. Forrestall—presented forthwith, 428. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/182.

Government Departments:

1. Order,—Return re travelling and entertainment expenses for past three years: Mr. Harding—presented forthwith, 326. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/158.
2. Order,—Return re work force in information offices prior to and since establishment of Information Canada, budget of Information Canada for 1971-72: Mr. Coates—presented forthwith, 378. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/87.
3. Order,—Return re public relations and research firms hired, purpose, costs, etc.: Mr. Orlikow—presented forthwith, 441. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/148.
4. Order,—Return re full-time payroll, by sex, as of Apr. 1, 1968 and 1971, persons earning more than \$18,000 per year: Mr. Orlikow—presented forthwith, 441-2. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/190.

Government Harbours and Piers Act:

Statement of wharf revenue receipts and harbour dues for 1970-71, 229. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/261.

Governor General and Lieutenant Governors:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 16 to *Journals*, 303.

Governor General's Communications and Messages:

See **Speaker, Mr.**

Governor General's Residence:

See **Rideau Palace Act.**

Grain:

Report to the House on sale of wheat to the U.S.S.R., 31. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/142.

Gray Report:

See **Investment.**

Great Lakes Pilatage Authority:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 22 to *Journals*, 335.

Greene, Hon. J.J.:

Resignation as Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources: See **Prime Minister.**

H

Harbour Commission Act amendment:

Bill C-227, Mr. Rose (Commission Membership). 1st R, 447.

Haulage of Loose Materials Safety Act:

Bill C-159, Mr. Skoberg. 1st R, 33.

Hazardous Household Products Labelling Act:

Bill C-146, Mr. Mather. 1st R, 26.

Hazardous Products Act:

1. Order in Council P.C. 1972-348, dated Feb. 29, 1972, amending Part I of the Schedule to said Act, 200. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/160.
2. Order in Council P.C. 1972-723, dated Apr. 18, 1972, amending Part II of the Schedule of said Act, 256. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/160A.
3. Order in Council P.C. 1972-756, dated Apr. 25, 1972, amending Part II of the Schedule of said Act, 291. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/160B.

Health and Welfare Department:

1. Report for 1969-70, 294. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/18.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee, 30.
3. Order,—Contracts re publicity and information entered into in 1970-71 and 1971-72: Mr. Nystrom; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 443.

Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee:

1. Membership, 32, 34, 52, 239, 243, 264, 270, 288, 297, 302, 309, 312, 328-9, 338, 344, 350, 352, 387.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department, Medical Research Council, National Capital Commission, National Health and Welfare Department, Prices and Incomes Commission, Urban Affairs Ministry, 30.
3. Bills referred: Family Income Security Plan Act, 263; Old Age Security Act amendment, 294.
4. Reports: First (Old Age Security Act amendment) (Appendix 14 to *Journals*), 296; Second (Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, National Capital Commission, Prices and Incomes Commission, Urban Affairs Ministry, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 19 to *Journals*), 311; Third (Family Income Security Plan Act, with amendment) (Appendix 27 to *Journals*), 351.

High Park constituency, change of name:

See **Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment.**

Highways:

See **Roads.**

Hijacking:

See **Agreements, Protocols, Exchange of Notes, etc.; Criminal Code amendment; Criminal Law Amendment.**

Holidays Act amendment:

Bill C-84, Mr. Scott (Victoria Day). 1st R, 25.

Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act:

Report on operation of agreements with provinces for 1970-71, 508. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/157.

House of Commons:

1. Legislative program, list of measures referred to in Speech from the Throne, 6. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/371. (*Printed in Hansard of Feb. 18, 1972*).
2. Commissioners of Internal Economy appointed, 6.
3. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Procedure and Organization Committee, 31. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 20 to *Journals*, 311.
4. Report of Internal Economy Commissioners (Nov. 4, 1970 to Dec. 15, 1971), 32. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/2.
5. Ordered,—That question of radio and television broadcasting of proceedings of House and its Committees, with evidence adduced in previous session be referred to Procedure and Organization Committee, 224. Reported with recommendations, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 38 to *Journals*, 471-86.
6. Extract from Minutes of meeting of Commissioners of Internal Economy, Apr. 24, 1972, relating to salary revisions for employees of House of Commons, 357. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/1.
7. Disturbance in: See **Criminal Code amendment.**
8. Quorum, increasing: See **British North America Act amendment.**
9. Representation: See **British North America Act amendment.**

Housing:

Order,—Report of Professor Charney on low cost housing prepared for task force appointed by Urban Affairs Minister: Mr. Orlikow; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 304.

See also **Residential Mortgage Financing Act; Supply Motions.**

Human Environment Conference:

See **United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.**

Human Rights:

See **Canada Human Rights Code.**

I**Immigrants:**

1. Loans to immigrants in 1971-72, 393. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/159.
2. Return of permits issued under authority of Act for 1971, 16. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/158.

Immigration:

See **Supply Motions.**

Immigration Act amendment:

Bill C-136, Mr. Mather (Mental Retardation). 1st R, 26.

Immigration Appeal Board:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Labour, Manpower and Immigration Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 12 to *Journals*, 283.

Immigration Appeal Board Act amendment:

Bill C-23, Mr. Haidasz. 1st R, 24. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 496.

Income Tax:

1. Return to Order of House, dated Dec. 16, 1971, for papers, etc. related to Chapter 8 of White Paper on Tax Reform, 7. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/12.
 2. Letter from National Revenue Minister to Mr. Peddle, M.P. re delay in refunds, 363. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/9.
- See also **Farmers**.

Income Tax Act:

1. Increasing basic exemption to \$3,000 for single persons and \$5,000 for married couples, with a further \$500 for each dependent child: motion (Mr. Godin), moved and debate interrupted, 41.
2. Interpretation Bulletin, dated Sept. 17, 1971, re sections 12(1)(b) and 11(1)(a), 241. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/5.

See also **Election Expenses Act**.

Income Tax Act amendment:

1. Bill C-44, Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West) (Section 239). 1st R, 24.
2. Ways and Means motion tabled Feb. 22, 1972, agreed to, 61. Bill C-169, Minister of Finance. 1st R, 61. 2nd R after debate, referred to Committee of the Whole, 202. Considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment and concurred in at report stage, 202-3. 3rd R moved; amendment (Mr. Broadbent),—To defer and refer back to Committee of the Whole to reconsider clause 2, moved, debated and negatived on recorded division, 203. Debate resumed, 3rd R agreed to, on division, 208. Passed by Senate, 228. R.A., 232. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 9, S.C. 1972.
3. Ways and Means motions tabled May 8, 1972, agreed to, 428-9. Bill C-222, Minister of Finance. 1st R, 429.

Indian Act amendment:

1. Bill C-27, Mr. Foster (Voting Age on Reserves). 1st R, 24.
2. Bill C-124, Mr. Rock (Rights of Indian Women upon Marriage). 1st R, 26.
3. Bill C-156, Mr. St. Pierre (Voting Age on Reserves). 1st R, 26.

Indian Affairs:

1. Number and amount of loans to Indians in 1971-72, 339. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/161.
2. Petition received from Old Crow Indians in Yukon Territory re aboriginal rights and report of the Clerk of Petitions, 35. (*Printed as appendix to Hansard of Mar. 1, 1972*).
3. Order,—Return re trip by dancers from Sioux Valley Reserve to Yugoslavia, organization or funding by certain departments, etc.: Mr. Macquarrie—presented forthwith, 271. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/49.
4. Order,—Correspondence between Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Indian bands or organizations re James Bay power development: Mr. Orlikow, 304. Presented, 393. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/57.
5. Order,—Return re rate of unemployment on reservations, programs to reduce, services provided by Canada Manpower: Mr. Robinson—presented forthwith, 337. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/291.
6. Order,—Financial statements of Yukon Native Brotherhood for years in which government grants were made: Mr. Nielsen, 363. Presented, 393. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/59.
7. Ordered, that Indian Affairs and Northern Development Committee be authorized to hear representations from Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, 504.

See also **B.C. Indian Land Question Act**.

Indian Affairs and Northern Development Committee:

1. Membership, 34, 52, 56, 62, 214, 225, 236, 243, 248, 254, 256, 264, 504.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Indian Affairs and Northern Development Department, Northern Canada Power Commission, 30.
3. Ordered, authorization to hear representations from Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, 504.

Indian Affairs and Northern Development Department:

1. Report for 1970-71, 14. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/13.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Indian Affairs and Northern Development Committee, 30. (Deemed reported—Issues 1 to 5 and 7 to 11 of Committee Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence).

Indian Hunting and Fishing Rights Act:

Bill C-108, Mr. Simpson. 1st R, 25.

Industrial Disputes:

Order,—Correspondence received by Prime Minister, Feb. 21-29, 1972, re strike of outside workers at Montreal or federal electronic technicians: Mr. Hellyer; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 246.

See also **St. Lawrence Ports Operations Act; Supply Motions; West Coast Ports Operations Act.**

Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act amendment:

Bill C-48, Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West) (Charity versus Closed Shop). 1st R, 24.

Industrial Research and Development Incentives Act amendment:

Bill C-218, Mr. Knight. 1st R, 392.

Industry, Trade and Commerce Department:

1. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 23 to *Journals*, 341.
2. Order,—Return re publicity and information expenditures in 1970-71, provisions in 1971-72 estimates, firms contracted with: Mr. Nystrom—presented forthwith, 442. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/480.
3. Order,—Contracts re publicity and information entered into in 1970-71 and 1971-72: Mr. Nystrom, 443. Presented, 492. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/48.

Industry, Trade and Commerce Department Act amendment:

1. Bill C-196, Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. 1st R, 267.
2. Bill C-219, Mr. Broadbent (Public Disclosure). 1st R, 396.

Information Canada:

1. Report for 1970-71, 45. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/304.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee, 29.
3. Order,—Reports resulting from Summer 71 Communications Research Project: Mr. Rowland, 344. Presented, 344-5. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/61. Supplementary return, 508. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/61A.

See also **Government Departments.**

Inquiries Act amendment:

Bill C-149, Mr. Alexander (Publication of Reports). 1st R, 26.

Insurance Department:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 23 to *Journals*, 341.

Internal Economy Commissioners:

See **House of Commons.**

International Agreements:

See **Agreements, Protocols, Exchange of Notes, Treaties, etc.**

International Development Association Act:

Report on operations for 1971, 233. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/74.

International Joint Commission:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to External Affairs and National Defence Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 15 to *Journals*, 300.

International Labour Conference:

Document re Canadian position with respect to conventions and recommendations adopted at the 53rd and 54th Sessions, 35. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/20.

International River Improvements Act amendment:

Bill C-93, Mr. Goode. 1st R, 25.

Investment:

1. Document entitled "Foreign Direct Investment in Canada", 269. Sess. Paper No. 284-4/49.
2. Draft bill re acquisitions of control of Canadian business by certain persons, 269. Sess. Paper No. 284-4/49A.

See also **Foreign Takeovers Review Act**.

Investment in Canada:

Private and Public Investment in Canada—Outlook 1972 and Regional Estimates, 231. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/213.

Irish Moss:

Order,—Return re requests from P.E.I. government for caragenn extraction plant, value of harvest for past ten years, processing: Mr. Macquarrie—presented forthwith, 428. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/361.

J**Japan:**

See **Canada-Japan Relations**.

Justice and Legal Affairs Committee:

1. Membership, 48, 52, 206, 214, 282, 288, 291, 297, 359, 373, 380.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Correctional Services, Justice Department, Law Reform Commission of Canada, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Solicitor General's Department, Tax Review Board, 30.
3. Bills referred: Criminal Law Amendment Act, 269; Protection of Privacy Act, 270.
4. Reports: First (Justice Department, Law Reform Commission, Tax Review Board, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 8 to *Journals*), 211; Second (Correctional Services, Solicitor General, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 11 to *Journals*), 283; Third (Criminal Law Amendment Act, with amendments) (Appendix 13 to *Journals*), 289-90; Fourth (Protection of Privacy Act, with amendments) (Appendix 29 to *Journals*), 381-2.

Justice Department:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 8 to *Journals*, 211.

Justice Department Act amendment:

Bill C-30, Mr. Fortin (Annual Report). 1st R, 24.

Juvenile Delinquents Act amendment:

Bill C-57, Mr. Robinson. 1st R, 24.

K**Kidnapping:**

See **Criminal Code amendment**.

L

Labour Department:

1. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Labour, Manpower and Immigration Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 5 to *Journals*, 205.
2. Order,—Consultant report on public opinion survey of 1968-69, as mentioned in answer to Question No. 1323 (p. 10597, *Hansard* of 1968-69 session): Mr. Skoberg, 66. Presented, 246. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/32.
3. Order,—Return re contracts awarded for publicity and information in 1970-71, amounts, etc., provisions in 1971-72 supplementary estimates: Mr. Nystrom—presented forthwith, 258. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/448.
4. Order,—Contracts in 1970-71 and 1971-72 re publicity or information: Mr. Nystrom, 383. Presented, 387-8. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/50.

Labour, Manpower and Immigration Committee:

1. Membership, 32, 34, 37, 44, 48, 50, 52, 204, 206, 218, 239, 254, 256, 270, 272, 280, 282, 288, 291, 297, 342, 350, 352, 359, 364, 373, 375, 380, 383, 386, 387, 390, 392.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Immigration Appeal Board, Labour Department, Manpower and Immigration Department, Unemployment Insurance Commission, 30.
3. Bills referred: Canada Labour Code Act amendment, 242; Adult Occupational Training Act amendment (Bill C-195), 278.
4. Reports: First (Labour Department, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 5 to *Journals*), 205; Second (Immigration Appeal Board, Manpower and Immigration Department, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 12 to *Journals*), 283; Third (Manpower and Immigration, Unemployment Insurance Commission, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 24 to *Journals*), 343; Fourth (Adult Occupational Training Act amendment) (Appendix 26 to *Journals*), 351; Fifth (Canada Labour Code Act amendment, with amendments) (Appendix 30 to *Journals*), 391-2.

Labour (Standards) Code:

See **Canada Labour (Standards) Code**, etc.

Labour Unions:

Order,—Return re number controlled by American parents, dues paid to international unions: Mr. Stewart (Okanagan Boundary)—presented forthwith, 327. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/337.

Labour Unions Returns:

See **Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act**.

Laurentian Pilotage Authority:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 22 to *Journals*, 335.

Law Reform Commission of Canada:

1. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 8 to *Journals*, 211.
2. Document entitled "First Research Program of the Law Reform Commission of Canada", dated March, 1972, 209. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/369.

Le Dain Commission:

See **Drugs, Narcotic**.

Library, National:

See **National Library**.

Library of Parliament:

1. Report of Librarian, 7. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/307.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Procedure and Organization Committee, 31. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 20 to *Journals*, 311.

Lobbying Control Act:

Bill C-121, Mr. Mather. 1st R, 26.

Local Initiatives Program:

See **Employment**.

M**Major's Hill Park Act:**

Bill C-31, Mr. Stewart (Cochrane). 1st R, 24.

Manpower and Immigration Department:

1. Report for 1970-71, 16. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/17.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Labour, Manpower and Immigration Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 12 to *Journals*, 283. Further reported, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 24 to *Journals*, 343.
3. Order,—Return re manpower mobility program, relocation requests, number approved, etc., by province: Mr. Laprise—presented forthwith, 237. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/92.
4. Order,—Return re contracts awarded for publicity and information in 1970-71, provisions in 1971-72 estimates, amounts, etc.: Mr. Nystrom—presented forthwith, 272. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/452.
5. Order,—Report by Operations Research Industries re management-information system in 1967-68, as mentioned in answer to Question No. 1323 (p. 10597, *Hansard* of 1968-69 session): Mr. Skoberg; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 304.

Manufacturing Industry:

Petition of Herman Weisz re authorship of report entitled "Concentration of Manufacturing Industries of Canada" and report of Clerk of Petitions, 361.

Marine Resources:

Development of national program for recovery and utilization through co-operation of skills between private enterprise and public service: motion (Mr. Forrestall), moved and debate interrupted, 294.

Marine Traffic Control (West Coast) Act:

Bill C-194, Mr. Groos. 1st R, 247.

Meat:

Order,—Return re imports in 1970 and 1971 of lamb and pork, quantities, countries: Mr. Godin—presented forthwith, 389. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/559.

Medals:

See **Awards, Decorations and Honours**.

Medical Care Act:

Report respecting operations for 1970-71, 464. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/298.

Medical Research Council:

1. Report for 1971-72, with auditor's report, 464. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/299.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee, 30.

Members of Parliament:

Motion (by unanimous consent under S.O. 43),—That allegations of wiretapping and opening of mail be referred to Privileges and Elections Committee, agreed to, 61. Reported on, 321-6.

See also **British North America Act amendment; Crown Corporations Act; Disclosure of Financial Interests Act; Disclosure of Interests Act**.

Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act:

Report for 1970-71, 215. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/173.

Membership (Changes in Representation):

Vacancies: Esquimalt-Saanich (resignation of David Anderson, Esq.), 507.

Mental Health:

Order,—Return re research grants, by province, in last three years, amounts: Mr. Orlikow—presented forthwith, 499. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/1.

Mining Industry:

See **Canada Development Corporation Act amendment.**

Mint, Royal Canadian:

1. Report of Master for 1971, 254. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/176.
2. Capital budget for 1971-72, 215. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/176A.

Miscellaneous Estimates Committee:

1. Membership, 34, 50, 52, 56, 62, 66, 199, 204, 206, 209, 214, 225, 243, 278, 282, 302, 352, 355-6, 359, 373, 380, 383, 386, 390, 419, 431, 438, 445, 508.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Auditor General, Canadian Arsenals Limited, Canadian Commercial Corporation, Commissioner of Official Languages, Governor General and Lieutenant Governors, National Research Council, Privy Council, Public Service Commission, Public Service Staff Relations Board, Science and Technology Ministry, Science Council of Canada, Supply and Services Department, Treasury Board, 30.
3. Estimates referred: Supplementary (B) 1971-72, 45.
4. Reports referred: Annual report of Public Service Commission for 1971, 347.
5. Reports: First (Supplementary Estimates (B), 1971-72) (Appendix 6 to *Journals*), 207; Second (Auditor General, Canadian Arsenals Limited, Canadian Commercial Corporation, Commissioner of Official Languages, Governor General and Lieutenant Governors, National Research Council, Privy Council, Public Service Staff Relations Board, Science and Technology Ministry, Science Council of Canada, Supply and Services, Treasury Board, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 16 to *Journals*), 303.

Motor Vehicle Safety Act amendment:

1. Bill C-17, Mr. Mather (Seat Belts). 1st R, 23. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 282.
2. Bill C-82, Mr. Mather (Bumpers). 1st R, 25.

Motor Vehicles:

See **Criminal Code amendment.**

Municipalities:

Remitting by government of consumption or sales taxes paid in five years preceding Jan. 1, 1972, in respect of municipal equipment: motion (Mr. Southam), moved and debate interrupted, 202-3.

Museums, National:

See **National Museums.**

N**NATO:**

See **North Atlantic Treaty Organization.**

National Anthem Act:

Bill C-158, Secretary of State. 1st R, 31.

National Arts Centre Corporation:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee, 29.

National Battlefields Commission:

Capital budget for 1972-73, 338-9. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/194A.

National Capital:

See **British North America Act** amendment.

Notional Capital Commission:

1. Report for 1971-72, 498. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/181.
2. Revised capital budget for 1971-72, 236. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/182.
3. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 19 to *Journals*, 311.

National Defence Act:

See **Criminal Law Amendment Act**.

National Defence Act amendment:

Bill C-107, Mr. Orlikow (Aid to the Civil Power). 1st R, 25.

National Defence Department:

1. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to External Affairs and National Defence Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 15 to *Journals*, 300.
2. Receipts and disbursements in special account (Replacement of Materiel) for 1971-72, 420. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/185.

National Energy Board:

1. Report on activities for 1971, 233. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/188.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to National Resources and Public Works Committee, 30. (Deemed reported—Issues 3 and 4 of Committee Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence).

National Film Board:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee, 29.

National Flag Act:

Bill C-46, Mr. Stewart (Cochrane). 1st R, 24.

National Harbours Board:

1. Financial statements for 1971, 424. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/154.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 22 to *Journals*, 335.
3. Order,—Return re grants made in lieu of taxation to certain cities since 1967: Mr. McCleave—presented forthwith, 362. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/76.

National Health and Welfare Department:

See **Health and Welfare Department**.

National Housing Act amendment:

1. Bill C-122, Mr. Alexander (Municipal Water and Soil Pollution Projects). 1st R, 26.
2. Bill C-213, Minister of State for Urban Affairs—To widen definition of co-operative housing project; to provide for a neighbourhood improvements program, etc. 1st R, 377-8.

Notional Library:

1. Report of Librarian for 1971-72, 493. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/169.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee, 29.

Notional Museums:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee, 29.

Notional Parks:

1. Order,—Description of area for proposed second National Park in Val Marie-Killdeer area of Saskatchewan: Mr. Burton; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 49-50. Moved and debate interrupted, 52. Debate resumed, motion agreed to, on division, 195. Presented, 219. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/17.
2. Order,—Return re area in square miles, development and expenditures by Indian Affairs and Northern Development Department: Mr. Stewart (Okanagan-Boundary)—presented forthwith, 327. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/330.

Notional Parks Act amendment:

Bill C-200, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. 1st R, 271.

Notional Research Council:

1. Report for 1971-72, 464. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/192.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 16 to *Journals*, 303.

National Resources and Public Works Committee:

1. Membership, 41, 48, 229, 248, 250, 254, 288, 291, 342.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Atomic Energy Control Board, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Eldorado Nuclear Limited, Energy, Mines and Resources Department, National Energy Board, Public Works Department, 30.

National Revenue Department:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 23 to *Journals*, 341.

Newfoundland Crossing Authority Act:

Bill C-45, Mr. Marshall. 1st R, 24.

News Sources Protection Act:

1. Bill C-42, Mr. Peters (Press Privilege). 1st R, 24.
2. Bill C-130, Mr. Fairweather (Press Privilege). 1st R, 26.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization:

Communique issued following Ministerial Session of North Atlantic Council in Bonn, May 30-31, 1972, 353. Sess. Paper No. 284-6/26. (*Printed as appendix to Hansard of June 5, 1972*).

Northern Conodo Power Commission:

1. Report for 1971-72, with auditor's report, 464. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/196.
2. Revised capital budget for year ending Mar. 31, 1972, 50. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/198A.
3. Capital budget for year ending Mar. 31, 1973, 50. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/198.
4. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Indian Affairs and Northern Development Committee, 30. (Deemed reported—Issue 6 of Committee Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence).

Northern Transportation Company Limited:

1. Report for 1971, with auditor's report, 254. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/201.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 22 to *Journals*, 335.

Northwest Territories:

1. Ordinances made by the Council and assented to Jan. 28, 1972, Mar. 12, 1972, June 30, 1972, 229, 309, 508. Sess. Paper Nos. 284-1/200, 284-1/200A, 284-1/200B.
2. Senate representation: See **British North America Act amendment**.
See also **Conodo Elections Act**.

Northwest Territories Air Transportation Employees Act:
Bill C-109, Mr. Orange. 1st R, 25.

O

Oaths of Office Bill (Pra farma):

Bill C-1, Prime Minister, Act respecting Administration of Oaths of Office, 1st R, 1.

Official Languages Commissioner:

See **Commissioner of Official Languages.**

Official Secrets Act:

See **Protection of Privacy Act.**

Oil and Gas:

1. Document re types of investigation by government departments regarding a northern pipeline, 241. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/6.
 2. Order,—Return re exploration permits issued in 1971 for Pacific coastal waters, number outstanding or revoked: Mr. Douglas—presented forthwith, 245. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/322.
 3. Order,—Return re Arctic pipeline, effect on ecology, government supported research studies: Mr. Robinson—presented forthwith, 267. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/315.
 4. Motion (by unanimous consent under S.O. 43),—That movement of oil by tanker along the British Columbia coast is inimical to Canadian interests and that said resolution be transmitted to the United States government, agreed to, 295.
 5. Order,—Agreement between Panarctic Oils Ltd. and U.S. consortium of companies re Arctic gas supplies: Mr. Douglas; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 344.
 6. Expanded guidelines for northern pipelines, 441. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/13.
- See also **Water Pollution.**

Old Age Assistance Act:

Report on administration for 1970-71, 383. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/203.

Old Age Security Act:

And Canada Pension Plan, amending to increase basic benefit to \$150 payable at age 60: motion (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre), moved and debate interrupted, 238.

Old Age Security Act amendment:

Bill C-207, Minister of National Health and Welfare—To increase old age pensions and guaranteed income supplement, to provide for an annual escalation based on Consumer Price Index. 1st R, 284. 2nd R moved; amendment (Mr. Marshall),—To decline second reading and consider certain changes, 287-8. Debate resumed, amendment ruled out of order, 2nd R agreed to, referred to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee, 293-4. Reported without amendment, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 14 to *Journals*, 296. Report stage, 301-2, 306. Motions to amend; ruled out of order, 301, 306, negatived on division, 306. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 306. 3rd R moved, amendment (Mr. Rynard),—To defer and refer back to committee to insert a new clause, ruled out of order, 306-7. Debate resumed, amendment (Mr. Fortin),—To defer and refer back to committee to lower age of entitlement and raise basic pension, ruled out of order, 307-8. Debate resumed and interrupted, 308-9. Debate resumed, 3rd R agreed to, 312. Passed by Senate, 317. R.A., 317. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 10, S.C. 1972.

Old Age Security and Canada Pension Plan Acts amendment:

Bill C-129, Mr. Allmand (Reduction in Qualifying Age). 1st R, 26.

Opportunities for Age Program:

See **Senior Citizens.**

Orders in Council:

Summaries of Orders passed December, 1971-March, 1972, 229, 350, 356, 498. Sess. Paper Nos. 284-1/362, 284-1/351, 284-1/352, 284-1/353.

P**Pacific Pilotage Authority:**

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 22 to *Journals*, 335.

Packaging and Labelling:

See **Consumption Date of Packaged Perishable Food Act**; **Detergents Labelling Act**; **Food and Drugs Act amendment**; **Hazardous Household Products Labelling Act**; **Poison Prevention Packaging Act**.

Paper Recycling Act:

Bill C-90, Mr. Goode. 1st R, 25.

Parks:

See **National Parks**.

Parliament Hill:

Press release, dated June 20, 1972, re building of promenade around the base of Parliament Hill, 392. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/11.

"Parliament Hill" Act:

Bill C-78, Mr. McIlraith (Prohibition of Commercial Use). 1st R, 25. 2nd R after debate, considered in Committee of the Whole by unanimous consent, reported without amendment, concurred in at report stage, 3rd R, 228. Passed by Senate with amendments, 263. Senate amendments agreed to, on division, 278. R.A., 317. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 11, S.C. 1972.

Parliamentary Commissioner Act:

Bill C-52, Mr. Thompson (Red Deer). 1st R, 24.

Parliamentary Library:

See **Library of Parliament**.

Parliamentary Secretaries:

Order in Council P.C. 1972-190, dated Feb. 3, 1972, appointing certain Parliamentary Secretaries, 9. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/205.

Parole Act:

See **Criminal Law Amendment Act**.

Penitentiaries:

1. Special Report 1 of Working Group on Federal Maximum Security Institutions Design (Chairman, J.W. Mohr), dated Nov. 30, 1971, 39. Sess. Paper No. 284-4/48.
2. Order,—Return re correctional institutions, number, wardens and qualifications: Mr. Orlikow—presented forthwith, 279. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/149.
3. Inmates, enfranchisement: See **Canada Elections Act amendment**.
See also **Geoffroy, Yves**.

Pension Act:

See **War Pensions and Allowances Acts amendment**.

Pension Act amendment:

Bill C-215, Minister of Veterans Affairs—To increase the number of commissioners and ad hoc commissioners. 1st R, 389. 2nd R after debate, referred to Veterans Affairs Committee, 423. Reported without amendment, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 35 to *Journals*, 434. Report stage, 463. 3rd R after debate, 463. Passed by Senate, 497. R.A., 506. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 20, S.C. 1972.

Pension Benefits Standards Act:

Report for 1971-72, 297. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/207.

Pension Benefits Standards Act amendment:

Bill C-228, Mr. Rose (Information to Employees). 1st R, 487.

Pensions:

1. Order,—Return re funds administered by government, names, contributors, assets, benefits paid in 1970-71: Mr. Rodrigue—presented forthwith, 238. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/266.
2. Order,—Return re payments under Public Service Pension Adjustment Act of 1959, pensions discontinued in last five years under Public Service Superannuation Act: Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)—presented forthwith, 353. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/30.

See also **Supply Motions**.

Pest Control:

Order,—Return re foreign spray aircraft engaged in Bertha Army worm control, duties or taxes levied: Mr. Nesbitt—presented forthwith, 36. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/90.

Petitions, Reports on:

See **Clerk of Petitions**.

Plant Noise Abatement Act:

Bill C-39, Mr. Mather. 1st R, 24.

Poison Prevention Packaging Act:

Bill C-110, Mr. Mather. 1st R, 25.

Pollution:

Solid-waste disposal, establishment of a national research and development program to investigate: motion (Mr. Alexander), moved and debate interrupted, 43.

See also **Canada-United States Agreements, Notes, etc.**; **Criminal Code amendment**; **Environmental Council of Canada Act**; **Excessive Outdoor Noises Act**; **National Housing Act amendment**; **Paper Recycling Act**; **Plant Noise Abatement Act**; **Supply Motions**; **United Nations Conference on the Human Environment**.

Polymer Corporation Limited:

1. Report for 1971, with auditor's report, 233. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/208.
2. Capital budget for 1972, 22. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/209.

Ports:

Order,—Return re government expenditures on certain ports in last ten years: Mr. Horner—presented forthwith, 257. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/253.

Post Office Department:

1. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. (Deemed reported—Issue 1 of Committee Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence).
2. Order,—Return re post offices built by Public Works Department in last four years, locations, revenues: Mr. Korchinski—presented forthwith, 344. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/503.

Postal Service:

1. Order,—Letters of complaint received by Postmaster General since Jan. 1, 1971: Mr. Dinsdale; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 272. Moved and debate interrupted, 276.
2. Address,—Correspondence with provinces re deteriorating service and courier service established in Alta.: Mr. Dinsdale; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 443.

See also **Supply Motions**.

Power:

1. Agreement with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick re establishment of Review Board to assess power development from Bay of Fundy tides, 35. Sess. Paper No. 284-5/50.
2. Address,—Correspondence with Manitoba during 1971, re Nelson River Power Project: Mr. Faulkner, 36. Presented 40. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/7.

See also **Adjournment to Discuss Matter of Urgent Public Importance; Indian Affairs**

Prices and Incomes Commission:

1. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 19 to *Journals*, 311.
2. Summary report, dated June, 1972, entitled "Inflation, Unemployment and Incomes Policy", 392. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/10.

See also **Supply Motions**.

Prime Minister:

Exchange of correspondence, dated Dec. 31, 1971, with Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources re resignation, 9. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/190.

Prime Minister's Office:

Order,—Return re travelling and entertainment expenses for past three years: Mr. Harding—presented forthwith, 326. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/158.

Privacy, Invasion of:

See **Protection of Privacy Act**.

Private Members' Motions Debated:

1. Income Tax Act, increasing basic exemption to \$3,000 for single persons and \$5,000 for married couples, with a further \$500 for each dependent child: motion (Mr. Godin), moved and debate interrupted, 41.
2. Pollution, establishment of a national research and development program to investigate solid-waste disposal: motion (Mr. Alexander), moved and debate interrupted, 43.
3. Municipalities, remitting by government of consumption or sales taxes paid in five years preceding Jan. 1, 1972, in respect of municipal equipment: motion (Mr. Southam), moved and debate interrupted, 202-3.
4. Canadian National Railways, discontinuance of passenger service in Newfoundland, rescinding order of Canadian Transport Commission authorizing: motion (Mr. McGrath), moved and debate interrupted, 224.
5. Old Age Security Act and Canada Pension Plan, amending to increase basic benefit to \$150 payable at age 60: motion (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre), moved and debate interrupted, 238.
6. External affairs, world centre for co-ordination, etc. of international relations, natural resources and environment, establishing: motion (Mr. MacDonald, Egmont), moved and debate interrupted, 268.
7. Senior citizens, Opportunities for Age Program, to improve health, economic and occupational, etc. opportunities, initiating: motion (Mr. Mather), moved and debate interrupted, 280.
8. Marine resources, development of national program for recovery and utilization through co-operation of skills between private enterprise and public service: motion (Mr. Forrestall), moved and debate interrupted, 294.
9. Roads, highways program for Atlantic provinces, declaration of cost-sharing formula and construction of Fundy Trail: motion (Mr. McCleave), moved and debate interrupted, 338.

Private Members' Motions Debated – (Concluded)

10. Regional development, extending designation of Renfrew County for special incentives beyond June 30, 1972: motion (Mr. McBride), moved and debate interrupted, 355.
11. Education, convening national conference on uniform standards at primary and secondary levels: motion (Mr. Lundrigan), moved and debate interrupted, 430.
12. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, television programs sold to U.S. networks but refused to Windsor station, referring to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee: motion (Mr. MacGuigan), moved and debate interrupted, 506.

Privileges and Elections Committee:

1. Membership, 48, 50, 52, 62, 229, 233, 239, 248, 256, 264, 312, 320, 364, 386, 387, 438-9, 464.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Chief Electoral Officer, 30.
3. Bills referred: Election Expenses Act, 364.
4. Referred: Wiretapping and opening of mail of Members, 61.
5. Reports: First (Chief Electoral Officer, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 2 to *Journals*), 65; Second (allegations re wiretapping and opening of mail of Members), 321-6.

Privy Council:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 16 to *Journals*, 303.

Procedure:**Address Debate:**

Ordered, that any recorded divisions on amendments be deferred until 9.30 p.m. on 7th appointed day, 17.

Adjournment Hour:

House adjourns after normal hour, 265, 501.
House adjourns at 3.05 a.m., Thursday, June 22, 1972, 420.
House adjourns prior to normal hour, 7, 10.
Motion to sit beyond adjournment hour under S.O. 6(5), objected to, 308.

Adjournment Motion under S.O. 26:

Stood over until next sitting, 261.

Allocation of Time:

Further consideration of government bill to be interrupted not less than one hour after calling of Government Orders and all questions put, 309.

Bills, Government; Introduction:

Placed on Order Paper for consideration at same stage it was at in previous session, 281.
Without required notice, by unanimous consent, 284.

Bills, Government; Reprint:

Amended by committee, ordered reprinted as amended, 290, 351, 382, 401.

Bills, Government; Second Reading Orders:

Committee redesignation, 463.
Debate adjourned, 280.
Debate, adjournment of, motion negatived on recorded division, 331-2.
On same day as introduced, 284, 500, 507.
Referred to Committee of the Whole, by unanimous consent, 463, 508.
Second reading and remaining stages completed at same sitting, 463.

Bills, Government; Report Stage:

Debate adjourned, by unanimous consent, 438, 495.

Procedure – (Continued)*Bills, Government; Report Stage Motions:*

Withdrawn, by unanimous consent, 196, 434, 496.

See also **Amendments**.

Bills, Government; Third Reading Orders:

Debate adjourned, 463.

On same day as concurred in with amendments at report stage, 302, 423-4, 491.

Bills, Private; Title Change:

Report stage amendment, 195.

Bills, Private; Introduction:

Tabled by Clerk of the House and deemed read a first time, 35.

Bills, Private; Third Reading Orders:

On same day as concurred in with amendments at report stage, 195.

Bills, Public (Private Members); Introduction:

Introduced and 1st reading *en bloc*, 23-6.

Order called and allowed to stand pending ruling by Mr. Speaker, 217-8.

Bills, Public (Private Members); Second Reading Orders:

Committee redesignation (referred to Committee of the Whole), 228.

Order discharged and bill withdrawn, 300.

Second reading and all remaining stages completed in same sitting, 62, 228.

Bills, Public (Private Members); Senate Amendments:

See **Senate Amendments to Commons Bills**.

Committees, Reports:

“Presenting Reports from Standing and Special Committees”, House reverts to, 296, 448.

Committees, Special (Joint); Reports:

Corrigendum to final report of Constitution Committee, 200.

Committees, Standing; Orders of Reference:

Evidence of previous session referred, 224, 291.

Radio and television broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and its Committees, referred to Procedure and Organization Committee, 224.

Wiretapping and opening of mail of Members, referred to Privileges and Elections Committee, 61.

Leave to adjourn from place to place:

Request by Committee, 67, 271, 299-300.

Approved, 277, 319.

Committees, Standing (Joint); Orders of Reference:

Authorization to meet while Senate is sitting, 263.

Committees, Standing; Reports:

Concurrence in, motion withdrawn by unanimous consent, 335.

Government Orders:

House proceeds to, Business of Supply having been called and not proceeded with, 375.

Motions:

Government motion *re ban* on Atlantic salmon fishing, by unanimous consent, 255.

House reverts to, 36, 224, 267, 269, 327.

Procedure – (Concluded)*Motions – (Concluded)*

- Under S.O. 43, agreed to, 61, 65, 295, 347, 375, 392.
- Under S.O. 43, debate adjourned on motion, 371-2.

Motions (Papers):

- Agreed to, after debate, on division, 195.
- Negatived, on division, 276.

Oral Questions:

- Period extended to 60 minutes, 235.

Orders of the Day:

- Motion to proceed to, negatived on recorded division, 370-1.

Petitions:

- Not received, pursuant to Speaker's ruling, 361-2.

Private Members Hour:

- Deferred or suspended, 312, 423, 508.

Routine Proceedings:

- House reverts to, 308.

Sittings of the House:

- Adjournment at 1.00 p.m., on occasion of Address to Parliament by President of United States, 232.
- Adjournment motion, negatived on recorded division, 372-3.
- Ordered,—That House meet at 8.00 p.m. on a Wednesday to consider a government bill, 500.
- Suspended until call of the Chair, 509.
- Suspended, 12.17 to 2.00 p.m., 6.
- See also **Sittings of the House.**

Speeches:

- Time limit, 255.

Supply:

- Allotted day, order called and not proceeded with, 375.
- Speeches, time limit, 45, 66, 205, 211, 347, 357, 383, 385, 397.

Vote:

- Deferred, 17, 302, 355.
- Deferred under S.O. 75(11), 422, 430, 433, 435, 443, 487-8, 497, 500.
- Unanimous, 287.

Ways and Means:

- Designation of days to consider, 59, 275, 421.

Procedure and Organization Committee:

1. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) House of Commons, Library of Parliament, Senate, 31.
2. Referred: Question of broadcasting of proceedings of House and Committees with evidence adduced in previous session, 224.
3. Reports: First (House of Commons, Library of Parliament, Senate, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 20 to *Journals*), 311; Second (Radio and television broadcasting of proceedings of House and its Committees, with recommendations) (Appendix 38 to *Journals*), 471-86.

Protection of Endangered Species Act:

- Bill C-68, Mr. Watson. 1st R, 24.

Protection of Privacy Act:

Bill C-6, Minister of Justice—To amend the Criminal Code, Crown Liability Act and Official Secrets Act; to create offences and to make the Crown liable for certain damages. 1st R, 12. 2nd R after debate, referred to Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, 269-70. Reported with amendments, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 29 to *Journals*, 381-2.

Public Accounts Committee:

1. Membership, 52, 60, 62-3, 204, 229, 312, 344, 350, 359, 375, 380, 386, 392, 438, 445.
2. Referred: Complaint of Auditor General *re* facilities and lateness of his report, 51; Authorization to draft bill *re* office, functions and powers of Auditor General, 224.
3. Reports referred: Public Accounts for 1968-69 and 1969-70 and Auditor General's Reports thereon, with evidence adduced in previous sessions, 291; Public Accounts for 1970-71 and Auditor General's Report thereon, 363.
4. Reports: First (Auditor General, facilities and delay in report, with recommendation *re* draft bill) (Appendix 7 to *Journals*), 207-8; Second (Auditor General's Report on Public Accounts for 1969-70, with recommendations) (Appendix 28 to *Journals*), 365-70; Third (Auditor General's Report on Public Accounts for 1968-69, with recommendations) (Appendix 37 to *Journals*), 465-71.

Public Accounts of Conodo:

1. Motion, by unanimous consent,—That Public Accounts for 1968-69 and 1969-70 and Auditor General's Reports thereon, with evidence adduced in previous sessions, be referred to Public Accounts Committee, agreed to, 291.
2. Motion,—That Public Accounts for 1970-71 and Auditor General's Report thereon be referred to Public Accounts Committee: Notice called and transferred to Government Orders, 337. Moved and agreed to, 363.

Public Archives:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee, 29.

Public Service:

1. Order,—Correspondence between Public Service Commission Chairman and Justice Minister *re* bilingualism: Mr. Orlikow; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 363.
2. Order,—Return *re* non-Canadians in employ of government, countries of origin: Mr. Latulippe—presented forthwith, 486. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/119.
3. Order,—Return *re* employees red-circled, years of service, effect on pension: Mr. Hales—presented forthwith, 486-7. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/329.
4. Grievances: See **Administrative Review Board Act**.

Public Service Commission:

1. Report for 1971, 345. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/216.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30.
3. Positions excluded from operation of Public Service Employment Act, 345. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/217.
4. Report on Delegation of Staffing Authority, 345. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/218.
5. Motion (by unanimous consent under S.O. 43),—That subject-matter of refusal to allow C.R.T.C. employee, Anne Booth, to seek political nomination be referred to the Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee, agreed to, 65. Reported with recommendations, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 9 to *Journals*, 221-2.
6. Motion (by unanimous consent under S.O. 43),—That Annual Report for 1971 be referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, agreed to, 347.

Public Service Employment Act:

See **Conodo Labour Code and Public Service Employment Act amendment**.

Public Service Employment Act amendment:

1. Bill C-115, Mr. Forrestall (Age Discrimination). 1st R, 25.
2. Bill C-127, Mr. Burton (Political Partisanship). 1st R, 26.

Public Service Staff Relations Act amendment:

1. Bill C-97, Mr. Allmand (Designated Employees). 1st R, 25.
2. Bill C-140, Mr. Orlikow (Collective Bargaining). 1st R, 26.

Public Service Staff Relations Board:

1. Report for 1970-71, 259. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/219.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 16 to *Journals*, 303.

Public Service Superannuation Act:

1. Report on administration for 1970-71, 233. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/220.
2. Statement on standing and transactions of regular forces death benefit account as at Mar. 31, 1972, 420. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/226.

Public Works Department:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to National Resources and Public Works Committee, 30. (Deemed reported—Issue 8 of Committee Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence).

Public's Rights to Freedom of Access to Public Documents Act:

1. Bill C-98, Mr. Mather. 1st R, 25.
2. Bill C-128, Mr. Roberts. 1st R, 26.

Publishing Industry:

See *Ryerson Press*.

Pulp and Paper Industry:

Order,—Return re number of paper plants, location, shut downs, lay-offs, subsidies paid since 1968, etc.: Mr. Rodrigue—presented forthwith, 428. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/464.

R**Railway Act amendment:**

1. Bill C-130, Mr. Allmand (Reduction in Passenger Service). 1st R, 26.
2. Bill C-160, Mr. Skoberg (Notice of Accidents). 1st R, 33.
3. Bill C-199, Mr. Skoberg (Deviations, Change and Removal). 1st R, 269.

Railways:

1. Petition from residents of Newfoundland re railway passenger service and report of Clerk of Petitions, 426.
2. Passenger service in South Western Ontario: See **Transport and Communications Committee—Reports, Second and Fourth**.

Refunds (Natural Resources) Act:

Statement on refunds, 50. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/225.

Regional Development:

Extending designation of Renfrew County for special incentives beyond June 30, 1972: motion (Mr. McBride), moved and debate interrupted, 355.

See also **Supply Motions**.

Regional Development Committee:

1. Membership, 44, 47, 56, 254, 258, 264, 268, 288, 291, 302, 309, 319-20, 328-9, 342.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Cape Breton Development Corporation, Regional Economic Expansion Department, 30.
3. Reports: First (Cape Breton Development Corporation, Regional Economic Expansion, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 25 to *Journals*), 347.

Regional Development Incentives Act:

Reports for periods ending Feb. 29, Mar. 31, Apr. 30, May 31, 1972, 56-7, 236, 318, 334, 424. Sess. Paper Nos. 284-1/323, 284-1/324, 284-1/325, 284-1/325A, 284-1/325B.

Regional Development Incentives Act amendment:

1. Bill C-59, Mr. MacDonald (Egmont) (Economic/Social Factors). 1st R, 24.
2. Bill C-216, Mr. Knight (Evaluation of Grants). 1st R, 392.
3. Bill C-217, Mr. Knight (Scrutiny of Applications). 1st R, 392.
4. Bill C-220, Mr. Broadbent (Public Funds). 1st R, 396.

Regional Economic Expansion Department:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Regional Development Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 25 to *Journals*, 347.

Regional Economic Expansion Department Act amendment:

Bill C-49, Mr. MacDonald (Egmont). 1st R, 24.

Regulations and Statutory Instruments Committee:

1. Message from Senate re power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the Senate, 263.
2. House membership, 208.
3. Senate membership, 52.

Renfrew North constituency, change of name:

See **Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment**.

Representation Commissioner Act amendment:

Bill C-202, Secretary of State—To provide for an increase in salary. 1st R, 279. 2nd R agreed to, referred, by unanimous consent to Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment, 3rd R agreed to, 463. Passed by Senate, 497. R.A., 506. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 21, S.C. 1972.

Research Animals Protection Act:

Bill C-171, Mr. Groos. 1st R, 195.

Residential Mortgage Financing Act:

Bill C-209, Minister of State for Urban Affairs—To provide additional mechanisms and institutions for residential mortgage market, to establish the Residential Mortgage Market Corporation and provide for its operation. 1st R, 295.

Restrictive Trade Practices Commission:

Report re supply and sale of beer in Ontario, 447. Sess. Paper No. 284-4/20.

Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act:

Financial statement on operations for 1971-72, 313. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/228.

Returns Ordered: (List of Returns unanswered at end of session)

See also index entries by subject-matter.

Part I—Motions for Papers

1. Yukon Wilderness Limited, correspondence between John Lammers and Indian Affairs and Northern Development Minister: Mr. Orlikow (Motion for Papers No. 43), 272.
2. Television, correspondence with Public Works Minister re television cable suspended from International Bridge between Calais, Maine and St. Stephen, N.B.: Mr. Flemming (Motion for Papers No. 66), 397.

Rhodesia:

Statement dated May 24, 1972, 327. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/7.

Richmond Constituency:

Order,—Return re government expenditures since 1960, projects carried out, future plans: Mr. Beaudoin—presented forthwith, 441. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/59.

Rideau Palace Act:

Bill C-53, Mr. McBride. 1st R, 24.

Right to Information Act:

Bill C-118, Mr. Baldwin. 1st R, 26.

Roads:

1. Order,—Return re costs borne by federal government since 1969 under agreement with P.E.I., erosion control standards: Mr. MacLean—presented forthwith, 237-8. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/204.
2. Highways program for Atlantic provinces, declaration of cost-sharing formula and construction of Fundy Trail: motion (Mr. McCleave), moved and debate interrupted, 338.
3. Petition from residents along eastern shore of N.S., re road transport from Port Bickerton to County Harbour and report of Clerk of Petitions, 385.

Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission:

Report for 1971, 273. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/229.

Royal Assent:

1. Bills Assented, 232, 317-8, 386, 492, 506, 510.
2. Letters from Government House, 231, 317, 385, 491, 506, 509.

Royal Canadian Mint:

See Mint, Royal Canadian.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police:

1. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 11 to *Journals*, 283.
2. Copy of contract with Municipality of Unity, Sask., for use or employment of RCMP, 14. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/274.
3. Copy of contract with Municipality of Charleswood, Man., for use or employment of RCMP, 209. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/270.
4. Copy of contract with Municipality of Souris, P.E.I., for use or employment of RCMP, 233. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/273.
5. Copy of contract with Municipality of Salmon Arm, B.C., for use or employment of RCMP, 264. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/268.
6. Copy of contract with Town of Fox Creek, Alta., for use or employment of RCMP, 288. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/266.
7. Copy of contract with Town of Fort Saskatchewan, Alta., for use or employment of RCMP, 329. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/266A.
8. Copy of contract with Town of Swan Hills, Alta., for use or employment of RCMP, 397. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/266B.
9. Copy of contract with Town of Raymond, Alta., for use or employment of RCMP, 420. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/266C.
10. Copy of contract with Town of Westlock, Alta., for use or employment of RCMP, 508. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/266D.
11. Copy of contract with Town of Montague, N.B., for use or employment of RCMP, 508. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/272.
12. Copy of contract with Town of Montague, P.E.I., for use or employment of RCMP, 508. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/273A.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act:

1. Report on actuarial examination of superannuation account as at Dec. 31, 1969, 309. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/232.
2. Report for 1971-72, 508. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/231.

Royal Commissions:

Order,—Return re number established since June 25, 1968, commissioners, reports, costs, printing facilities used: Mr. Coates—presented forthwith, 343-4. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/86.

Royal Society of Canada:

1. Minutes of proceedings for 1971, 492. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/233.
2. Financial statement, certified by auditors, for period ended Feb. 29, 1972, 492. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/233A.

Ryerson Press:

Order,—Correspondence, etc. between Government and United Church of Canada and other organizations re sale: Mr. Macquarrie; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 284.

S**St. Lawrence Ports Operations Act:**

Bill C-230, Minister of Labour. 1st R, 499. 2nd R agreed to, after debate, 500-1. Considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment, motion for concurrence agreed to, 3rd R agreed to, 504. Passed by Senate, 506. R.A., 506. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 22, S.C. 1972.

St. Lawrence Seaway Authority:

1. Report for 1971, with auditor's report, 318. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/242.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 22 to *Journals*, 335.

Science and Technology Ministry:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 16 to *Journals*, 303.

Science Council of Canada:

1. Report for 1971-72, 498. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/234.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 16 to *Journals*, 303.

Seaway International Bridge Corporation Limited:

Report for 1971, with auditor's report, 318. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/235.

Secretary of State Department:

1. Report for 1969-70, 493. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/24.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts Committee, 29. (Deemed reported—Issues 8, 9 and 10 of Committee Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence).
3. Order,—Study re federal government and the arts, undertaken in 1966-67, referred to in answer to Question No. 1323 (p. 10597, *Hansard* of 1968-69 session): Mr. Skoberg; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 397.

Seed Grain Indebtedness:

List of appointments and adjustments on advances of seed grain, fodder for animals, etc., Oct. 5, 1970 to Feb. 16, 1972, 50. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/237.

Senate:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Procedure and Organization Committee, 31. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 20 to *Journals*, 311.

See also **British North America Act amendment.**

Senate Amendments to Commons Bills:

"Parliament Hill" Act (Bill C-78) passed by Senate with amendments, 263. Amendments concurred in, on division, 278.

Senate and House of Commons Act amendment:

Bill C-88, Mr. Anderson (St. Luke 11:46). 1st R, 25.

Senior Citizens:

Opportunities for Age Program, to improve health, economic and occupational, etc. opportunities, initiating: motion (Mr. Mather), moved and debate interrupted, 280.

Shipping:

Report for 1971 for exemptions authorized when no master or officer was available with required certificate under Shipping Act, 66. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/239.

See also **Certification of Masters Act; Foreign Vessels Construction Standards Act; Marine Traffic Control (West Coast) Act; West Coast Marine Traffic Reporting Zone Act.**

Shipping Act:

See **Canada Shipping Act amendment.**

Shipping Conferences Exemption Act:

Report on operations for 1971, 239. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/367.

Sir John A. Macdonald Day Act:

Bill C-102, Mr. Macquarrie. 1st R, 25.

Sittings of the House:

1. Motion,—That notwithstanding S.O. 2(2), the House shall meet at 11.00 a.m., Friday, Feb. 18, 1972, and shall not be adjourned until all party leaders have spoken in the Address Debate, agreed to, 6.
 2. Motion,—That the House shall adjourn at 1.00 p.m., Friday, Apr. 14, 1972, and that the address by President Nixon of the United States be appended to *Hansard*, agreed to, 232.
 3. Ordered,—That notwithstanding first paragraph of Special Order made Mar. 29, 1972, when the House adjourns Apr. 13, 1972, it shall stand adjourned until Apr. 17, 1972, 235.
 4. Motion,—That on June 26, 27 and 29, 1972, the House shall sit from 11.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. in addition to regular hours, agreed to, 421.
 5. Ordered, by unanimous consent,—That when House adjourns June 30 it shall stand adjourned until July 4, 1972, 491.
- See also **Procedure.**

Small Businesses Loans Act:

Report for 1971, 364. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/240.

Small Loans Act amendment:

Bill C-187, Mr. Rowland. 1st R, 231.

Solicitor General's Department:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 11 to *Journals*, 283.

Speaker, Mr.:

1. Communicated letter from Governor General's Secretary re Opening of Parliament, 1.
 2. Reported Speech from Throne, 1.
 3. Informed House of Report of Clerk of Petitions, 35, 251, 361, 385, 426.
 4. Communicated letters re Royal Assent, 231, 317, 385, 491, 506, 509.
 5. Informed House of vacancy in representation and of issue of new warrant for writ of election, 507.
 6. Communicated letter from Governor-General's Secretary re prorogation, 509.
- See also **Designation of the Speaker of the House of Commons as the Member for Parliament Hill Act.**

Speaker's Rulings and Statements:*Address Debate:*

See ruling under heading *Throne Speech*.

Bills, Government:

On a point of order raised by Mr. McGrath, that Bill C-170 (Family Income Security Plan Act) purported to amend the same act as a bill before the Senate, Mr. Speaker ruled that when a decision had been reached on a legislative proposal the same matter could not be discussed again in the same session, but no decision had been taken in current session which would preclude consideration of legislation now before the House, 218.

Bills, Government; Ways and Means Motion Preceding:

On a point of order raised by Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), regarding practices in relation to budgetary proposals, Mr. Speaker ruled that there was no requirement that Ways and Means legislation be based on a budget presentation of the same session and suggested the Procedure and Organization Committee might study the matter, 202.

Bills, Government; Second Reading Amendments:

Mr. Downey during debate on motion for second reading of Bill C-7 (Explosives Act amendment), proposed an amendment to decline second reading, affirm a certain principle and refer subject-matter to committee. Mr. Acting Speaker ruled the amendment out of order since a reasoned amendment cannot oppose the principle of the bill and at the same time refer the subject-matter to committee, 208.

Mr. Marshall during debate on motion for second reading of Bill C-207 (Old Age Security Act amendment), proposed an amendment to decline second reading and consider introducing legislation to make certain changes, 288. Mr. Deputy Speaker outlining the criteria for reasoned amendments ruled that the amendment neither opposed the principle of the bill nor did it meet the other requirements, 293-4.

Mr. Macquarrie during debate on motion for second reading of Bill C-211 (Election Expenses Act), proposed an amendment to decline second reading because of failure to provide adequate reform, 312. Mr. Acting Speaker outlining the criteria for reasoned amendments ruled the amendment out of order in that it did not oppose the principle of the bill. He also suggested the Procedure and Organization Committee study reasoned amendments, 315-7.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) during debate on motion for second reading of Bill C-211 (Election Expenses Act), proposed an amendment to defer and introduce legislation to effectively control election expenses. Mr. Acting Speaker ruled amendment out of order in that it did not oppose principle of bill and anticipated amendments that could be made at committee stage, 333-4.

Mr. Fairweather during debate on motion for second reading of Bill C-201 (Foreign Takeovers Review Act), proposed an amendment to defer and introduce more comprehensive legislation. Mr. Deputy Speaker stated that consideration as to the acceptability of reasoned amendments had not been altered by rule changes and ruled amendment out of order in that it did not oppose principle of bill, 337-8.

Mr. Saltzman during debate on motion for second reading of Bill C-201 (Foreign Takeovers Review Act), proposed an amendment to defer and introduce legislation providing for independent review body to control foreign investment including established foreign-owned corporations. Mr. Deputy Speaker ruled amendment out of order in that it did not oppose principle of bill and went beyond scope of bill, 354.

Bills, Government; Report Stage Motions:

During debate on Bill C-8 (Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act), Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West) proposed a motion to add that certain regulations under the Act be subject to a negative resolution of the provinces. Mr. Deputy Speaker ruled the motion in order in that it was not substantive or beyond the scope of the clause it attempted to amend, 196.

During debate on Bill C-207 (Old Age Security Act amendment), Mr. Speaker ruled that motions standing in the names of Messrs. Rodrigue, Laprise, Fortin and Gauthier were out of order in that they infringed upon the financial initiative of the Crown, 301.

*Speaker's Rulings and Statements – (Continued)**Bills, Government; Report Stage Motions – (Concluded)*

During debate on Bill C-207 (Old Age Security Act amendment), Mr. Rynard proposed a motion to increase the basic pension to ninety dollars. Mr. Speaker ruled the motion out of order in that it infringed upon the financial initiative of the Crown, 306.

During debate on Bill C-207 (Old Age Security Act amendment), Mr. Rynard proposed a motion to strike out certain words and add others. Mr. Acting Speaker ruled the motion out of order in that it infringed upon the financial initiative of the Crown, 306.

During debate on Bill C-170 (Family Income Security Plan Act), Mr. Marshall proposed a motion to insert a new clause relating to benefit payments. Mr. Acting Speaker ruled the motion out of order in that it infringed upon the financial initiative of the Crown, 434.

During debate on Bill C-5 (Farm Credit Act amendment), Mr. Mazankowski proposed a motion to delete certain words and add others. Mr. Deputy Speaker ruled the motion out of order in that it sought to amend the Act rather than amending the bill and infringed upon the financial initiative of the Crown, 444.

Statements re grouping of proposed motions, 425-6, 497.

Bills, Government; Third Reading Amendments:

Mr. McCleave during debate on motion for third reading of Bill C-8 (Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, 1972), proposed an amendment to defer and resolve that the action of the government was without constitutional authority. Mr. Acting Speaker ruled the amendment out of order in that it was beyond the scope of the bill, 197.

Mr. Rynard during debate on motion for third reading of Bill C-207 (Old Age Security Act amendment), proposed an amendment to defer and refer back to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee to insert a new clause. Mr. Acting Speaker ruled the amendment out of order in that it went beyond the principle of the bill and infringed upon the financial initiative of the Crown, 307.

Mr. Fortin during debate on motion for third reading of Bill C-207 (Old Age Security Act amendment), proposed an amendment to defer and refer back to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee to lower the age of entitlement and increase basic pension. Mr. Speaker noting the differences between a reasoned amendment and one referring a bill back to committee ruled the amendment out of order in that it would authorize the committee to do something which the House itself could not do, that is amend the financial orders of the Crown, 308.

Bills, Public (Private Members); Introduction and First Reading:

On the 7th sitting day of the Session when the first list of Private Members Public Bills appeared for Introduction on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker stated that all such bills would be scrutinized for defects prior to second reading because the Chair was not yet in a position to review them to judge their acceptability under the rules and that all bills would be deemed to have been introduced and given first reading, 23.

Messrs. Gilbert, Rose and Harding having sought leave to introduce bills amending the Unemployment Insurance Act, Mr. Speaker ruled three of the bills out of order in that they infringed upon the financial initiative of the Crown and while allowing four others expressed serious doubt concerning the financial implications of certain provisions. Regarding one bill he ruled that the explanatory note was argumentative and must be corrected before introduction, 222-3.

Mr. Broadbent having sought leave to introduce a bill to amend the Regional Development Incentives Act, Mr. Speaker ruled the bill out of order on the ground that it infringed upon the financial initiative of the Crown in that it redirected funds as approved by the Royal Recommendation which preceded the bill establishing the original Act, 396.

Bills, Public (Private Members); Second Reading:

Following debate on motion for second reading of Bill C-23 (Immigration Appeal Board Act amendment), Mr. Deputy Speaker stated that procedural acceptability of the bill was in doubt as certain clauses involved an expenditure of money and ruled that the debate in this instance should not set a precedent, 496.

Budget Presentation:

See ruling under heading *Bills, Government; Ways and Means Motion Preceding*.

Speaker's Rulings and Statements – (Concluded)*Committees, Reports:*

On a point of order and questions of privilege regarding the tabling of minority reports, Mr. Speaker ruled that dissident opinions might be included in a report but that neither the Standing Orders nor precedents allowed minority reports to be tabled and suggested that the Procedure and Organization Committee study the problem, 194-5.

Documents, Tabling:

On a point of order raised by Mr. Woolliams to the effect that certain documents having been quoted in the House by a minister should be tabled, Mr. Speaker ruled that any document which becomes part of the record of a department is then a public document and when cited by a minister ought to be tabled, 15.

Estimates:

On a point of order raised by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) regarding opposed items in the estimates, Mr. Deputy Speaker ruled that notice of opposition to an item in the estimates was not a motion taking precedence over a government motion for concurrence but only notice that a member would like to vote against a particular item, 401-2.

Motions:

Mr. Diefenbaker having proposed a motion under S.O. 43 concerning public statements made by Mr. Lewis, Mr. Speaker ruled that he had reservations as to certain procedural aspects even though there was unanimous consent to proceed with the motion since this consent applied only to waiver of notice and did not affect rules applicable to form and content of motions. He further stated that the motion might be put after re-drafting or proposed under another Standing Order but this was a matter for consultation between parties involved, 299.

Petitions:

A petition re authorship of a certain report, having been presented to the House, Mr. Speaker quoting authorities on modern practices concerning petitions ruled that petition could not be received, 361-2.

Privilege, Question of:

Notices of five questions of privilege regarding the tabling of the Auditor General's report having been received and one motion adopted by the government and agreed to, Mr. Speaker ruled that charges against public servants have always been regarded as breaches of order but not of privilege and that the matter of the Auditor General's facilities was of an administrative nature which should be dealt with by way of a substantive motion rather than privilege, 55-6.

On a question of privilege raised by Mr. Lewis regarding a motion proposed by Mr. Diefenbaker, Mr. Speaker ruled the matter was essentially one of debate rather than privilege and when questioning a member's conduct a specific charge must be made, 300-1.

Supply Motion Amendments:

Amendment (Mr. McGrath) having been proposed to motion under S.O. 58, Mr. Deputy Speaker ruled amendment out of order in that it would make substantive changes in main motion, 348.

Throne Speech:

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) proposed an amendment to the motion for consideration of the Throne Speech later this day, to provide for a question period. Mr. Speaker ruled the amendment out of order on the ground that it was a substantive motion and that the main motion and proceedings were based on 100 years of tradition, 5-6.

Special Areas:

See Regional Development.

Standards Council of Canada:

1. Report for 1971-72, with auditor's report, 511. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/76.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 23 to *Journals*, 341.

Statistics Act amendment:

Bill C-61, Mr. MacDonald (Egmont) (Area Statistics). 1st R, 24.

Statistics Canada:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 23 to *Journals*, 341.

Statutory Orders and Regulations:

Statutory Orders and Regulations of Mar. 8, 1972, 53. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/335.

Student Loans:

See *Canada Student Loans Plan*.

Students, Summer Employment:

1. Order,—Return re surveys by Statistics Canada and Manpower and Immigration Department, statistics, discrepancies: Mr. MacDonald (Egmont)—presented forthwith, 354. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/564.
2. Order,—Return re students hired as guides by Indian Affairs and Northern Development Department, recommendations of Members of Parliament, language qualifications: Mr. Muir—presented forthwith, 487. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/629.

Suicide, Attempted:

See *Criminal Code amendment*.

Supersonic Aircraft Act:

Bill C-106, Mr. St. Pierre. 1st R, 25.

Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act:

Report on administration for 1970-71, 233. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/366.

Supply:

1. Ordered,—That Business of Supply be considered at next sitting, 34.
2. (a) Estimates, 1971-72:
Supplementary (B), presented and referred, 45. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/132A.
(b) Estimates, 1972-73:
Main, presented, 17, referred, 29-31. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/132.
3. Resolutions adopted (Estimates by Departments):
(a) Main Estimates, 1972-73: Anti-Dumping Tribunal vote 10, on division, 410; Canadian International Development Agency vote 25, on recorded division, 409-10; Commissioner of Official Languages vote 15, on division, 414-5; Communications vote 1, on recorded division, 402-3; Consumer and Corporate Affairs vote 10, on recorded division, 403-4; Economic Council of Canada vote 20, on division, 415; Energy, Mines and Resources votes 1, 5 and 15, on recorded division, 405-7; Environment votes 1 and 5, on recorded division, 407-8; External Affairs vote 1, on recorded division, 408-9; Finance votes 1 and 20, on division, 410; House of Commons vote 5, on division, 414; Indian Affairs and Northern Development votes 1, 5, 20 and 65, on division, 410-1; Industry, Trade and Commerce votes 1, 20 and 25, on division, 411; Information Canada vote 25, on recorded division, 417-8; Justice vote 1, on division, 411; Manpower and Immigration votes 1, 5, 15 and 20, on division, 411; Medical Research Council vote 50, on division, 413; National Defence votes 1, 30 and 35, on division, 412-3; National Defence vote 5, on recorded division, 412; National Health and Welfare votes 1, 5, 10, 20, 25, 35 and 40, on division, 413; National Revenue votes 1 and 5, on division, 413; Post Office vote 1, on division, 414; Prices and Incomes Commission vote 25, on recorded division, 404-5; Public Service Staff Relations Board vote 25, on division, 415; Public Works votes 1, 10, 15, 20, 25, 35 and 40, on division, 415; Regional Economic Expansion votes 1 and 10, on division, 415; Science Council of Canada vote 5, on division, 415-6; Secretary of State votes 1, 5,

Supply – (Concluded)**3. Resolutions adopted (Estimates by Departments) – (Concluded)****(a) Main Estimates, 1972-73 – (Concluded)**

15, 25, 40, 60, 85, 90, 95 and 105, on division, 416; Senate vote 1, on recorded division, 413-4; Solicitor General votes 1, 5 and 20, on division, 416-7; Statistics Canada vote 45, on division, 411; Supply and Services votes 1, 5 and 10, on division, 417; Tariff Board vote 25, on division, 410; Transport votes 1, 5, 10, 20, 25, 40, 55 and 75, on division, 418; Treasury Board votes 1 and 25, on division, 418; Urban Affairs votes 1 and 20, on division, 419; Veterans Affairs votes 1 and 45, on division, 419.

(b) Main Estimates, 1972-73, less votes concurred in this day and amounts voted in Interim Supply, on division, 419.**Supply and Services Department:**

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 16 to *Journals*, 303.

Supply Bills:

1. Resolution (Supplementary Estimates (B), 1971-72), Bill C-175 (Appropriation Act No. 1, 1972), President of the Treasury Board, Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for year ending March 31, 1972. 1st R, 2nd R, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment, concurred in at report stage, 3rd R, 213-4. Passed by Senate, 232. R.A., 232. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 1, S.C. 1972.
2. Resolution (First Interim Supply, based on 1972-73 Estimates), Bill C-176 (Appropriation Act No. 2, 1972), President of the Treasury Board, Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for public service for year ending March 31, 1973. 1st R, 2nd R, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment, concurred in at report stage, 3rd R, on division, 214. Passed by Senate, 232. R.A., 232. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 2, S.C. 1972.
3. Resolution (Main, based on 1972-73 Estimates), Bill C-221 (Appropriation Act No. 3, 1972), President of the Treasury Board, Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for year ending Mar. 31, 1973. 1st R, 2nd R, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment, 3rd R, on division, 419. Passed by Senate, 445. R.A., 492. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 15, S.C. 1972.

Supply Motions under S.O. 58:

1. Motion (Mr. Baldwin),—House urges Government to exercise greater control over estimates and expenditures, 46. Amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre),—Amending Standing Orders to provide adequate consideration of estimates, 46. Debate interrupted by Mr. Speaker at appointed time and amendment negatived on recorded division, 46. Main motion negatived on recorded division, 47.
2. Motion (Mr. Lewis),—House condemns Government for failure to eliminate regional disparity, 56.
3. Motion (Mr. Stanfield),—House condemns Government for failure to deal with problem of urbanization and co-operate with other levels of government on matters of pollution, poverty, transportation, etc., 59.
4. Motion (Mr. Asselin),—House urges government to expedite public services which affect benefits in respect of unemployment insurance, pensions, immigration procedures, etc., 66.
5. Motion (Mr. Matte),—House regrets government failure to establish consultative bodies with provinces and municipalities to decentralize monetary and fiscal policies, 199.
6. Motion (Mr. Harding),—House urges establishment of national standards for all pollutants and an Environmental Council and loans to municipalities for sewage treatment, 205.
7. Motion (Mr. Rynard),—Government failure to increase pensions and benefits according to increase in Consumer Price Index, 211. Amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre),—Failure to raise all benefits to adequate levels, 211-2. Moved and debate interrupted by Mr. Speaker at appointed time and amendment negatived on recorded division, 212. Main motion negatived on recorded division, 213.
8. Motion (Mr. Stanfield),—Government failure to create employment and encourage investment in industry, 251. Amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre),—Failure to reform tax system and reduce tax burden on certain classes, 252. Debate interrupted by Mr. Speaker at appointed time and amendment negatived on recorded division, 252. Main motion negatived on recorded division, 253.
9. Motion (Mr. Baldwin),—House, noting erosion of parliamentary control over government expenditures as noted in 1970-71 Auditor General's report, affirms principle of parliamentary control of expenditures, 336.

Supply Motions under S.O. 58 – (Concluded)

10. Motion (Mrs. MacInnis),—Government failure to cope with increased food prices and supermarket profits, referring to special committee, 347-8. Amendment (Mr. McGrath),—Failure of Prices and Incomes Commission to report on food price stability, amending terms of reference, ruled out of order, 348. Amendment (Mr. Woolliams),—Including increased transportation costs, moved and debate interrupted at appointed time by Mr. Speaker and amendment negatived on recorded division, 349. Main motion negatived on recorded division, 349-50.
11. Motion (Mr. McCleave),—Government failure to provide decent housing at reasonable prices, 352.
12. Motion (Mr. Thomas, Moncton),—Failure to develop national transportation policy, 357. Amendment (Mr. Benjamin),—To introduce legislation providing for public ownership of Canadian Pacific Company, moved and debate interrupted, 357-8.
13. Motion (Mr. Baldwin),—Government failure to inform public, introducing legislation to provide rules for freedom of information, 383.
14. Motion (Mr. Dionne),—Government failure to involve workers in profit sharing and stock purchase programs as a means of promoting social stability and reinforcing economy, 385-6.
15. Motion (Mr. Valade),—Government refusal to intervene in dispute between International Longshoremen's Association and Maritime Employers' Association despite damages to St. Lawrence seaports, etc., 387.
16. Motion (Mr. Nystrom),—Government failure to produce a program to deal with unemployment among youth and its disregard of youth's aspirations, 389.
17. Motion (Mr. Baldwin),—Failure of government's incentive programs to stimulate trade and production and increase employment opportunities, 392.
18. Motion (Mr. Stanfield),—Government failure to proceed with a positive legislative program and carry out the program proposed in the Speech from the Throne, 397.
19. Motion (Mr. Gauthier),—Deterioration of federal-provincial relations due to government's policies and failure to make available necessary funds, 401.

Supreme Court Act amendment:

Bill C-150, Mr. McCleave (Judicial Office). 1st R, 26.

Supreme Court of Canada:

General Order amending rules, 22. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/246.

T**Tariff Board:**

1. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, 29. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 23 to *Journals*, 341.
2. Report on strawberries for processing, with transcript of evidence, 435. Sess. Paper No. 284-4/1.

Tax Review Board:

1. Report for 1971, 229. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/297.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 8 to *Journals*, 211.

Telesat Canada:

Report for 1971, 345. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/305.

Television:

Address,—Correspondence with Public Works Minister re television cable suspended from International Bridge between Calais, Maine and St. Stephen, N.B.: Mr. Flemming, 397.

Temiscouata constituency, change of name:

See Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment.

Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act amendment:

1. Bill C-11, Mr. Anderson (Continental Shelf). 1st R, 23. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 249.
2. Bill C-157, Mr. Howard (Skeena) (Extending Fishing Zones). 1st R, 26.

Territorial Supreme Courts Act:

- Bill S-3, Minister of Justice. Received from Senate, 211. 1st R, 217. 2nd R agreed to, referred, by unanimous consent to Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment, 3rd R agreed to, 463. R.A., 492. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 17, S.C. 1972.

Textile and Clothing Board:

- Report dated Dec. 16, 1971, *re* acrylic threads, together with a news release, dated July 7, 1972, 505. Sess. Paper No. 284-4/152.

Textile Industry:

1. Order,—Report by Economist Intelligence Unit *re* guidance and assesment as mentioned in answer to Question No. 1323 (p. 10597, *Hansard* of 1968-69 session): Mr. Skoberg; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 443.
2. Order,—Report by Gherzi Textile Organization as mentioned in answer to Question No. 1323 (p. 10597, *Hansard* of 1968-69 session): Mr. Skoberg; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 443.

Textiles and Clothing:

1. Order,—Return *re* manufacture of thread for Canadian textile plants, imports and grants in last three years: Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse)—presented forthwith, 36. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/116.
2. Order,—Study by Summerour and Associates Inc. *re* Manitoba garment industry: Mr. Orlikow; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 246. Moved and debate interrupted, 248. Debate resumed, motion negatived, on division, 276.

Throne Speech:

- See *Address in Reply, Debate on; Speaker's Rulings and Statements.*

Tobacco Health Hazard Act:

- Bill C-152, Mr. Robinson. 1st R, 26.

Tobacco Restraint Act:

- Bill C-10, Mr. Mather. 1st R, 23. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 218.

Trade:

- Order,—Return *re* development programs identified with a particular region of Canada, examples, specific benefits: Mr. Nystrom—presented forthwith, 499. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/461.

Transport and Communications Committee:

1. Membership, 34, 60, 62-3, 66, 206, 229, 248, 256, 270, 282, 297, 318, 320, 334, 336, 375, 392, 397.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Atlantic Pilotage Authority, Canadian National Railways, Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation, Canadian Transport Commission, Communications Department, Great Lakes Pilotage Authority, Laurentian Pilotage Authority, National Harbours Board, Northern Transportation Company Limited, Pacific Pilotage Authority, Post Office, St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, Transport Department, 30.
3. Reports: First (adjournment from place to place), 67; Second (adjournment from place to place), 271; Third (Atlantic Pilotage Authority, Canadian National Railways, Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation, Canadian Transport Commission, Communications, Great Lakes Pilotage Authority, Laurentian Pilotage Authority, National Harbours Board, Northern Transportation Company Limited, Pacific Pilotage Authority, St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, Transport, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 22 to *Journals*), 335; Fourth (Railway passenger service in South Western Ontario, with recommendations) (Appendix 31 to *Journals*), 395-6.
4. Reports concurred in: Second, on notice without debate, 277.
5. Reports, motion for concurrence: First, withdrawn by unanimous consent, 335.

Transport Department:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 22 to *Journals*, 335.

Transport Department Act amendment:

Bill C-56, Mr. Orlikow. 1st R, 24.

Transportation:

Final report entitled "The Canadian Northwest Transportation Study", dated November, 1970, 495. Sess. Paper No. 284-4/50.

See also **Atlantic Region Transportation; Supply Motions.**

Treasury Board:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Miscellaneous Estimates Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 16 to *Journals*, 303.

Trois Rivières constituency, change of name:

See **Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act amendment.**

U**Unemployment Insurance:**

See **Supply Motions.**

Unemployment Insurance Act amendment:

1. Bill C-177, Mr. Blackburn (Sick Leave Pay). 1st R, 217.
2. Bill C-178, Mr. Skoberg (Labour Disputes). 1st R, 217.
3. Bill C-179, Mrs. MacInnis (Maternity Benefits). 1st R, 217.
4. Bill C-180, Mr. Peters (Holiday Pay). 1st R, 223. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 228.
5. Bill C-181, Mr. Peters (Retirement Benefits). 1st R, 223-4.
6. Bill C-182, Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) (Benefits at Time of Retirement). 1st R, 224.
7. Bill C-185, Mr. Howard (Skeena) (Justitia Pro Societas). 1st R, 228.

Unemployment Insurance Commission:

1. Report for 1971, 492-3. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/250.
2. Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Labour, Manpower and Immigration Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 24 to *Journals*, 343.
3. Order,—Contracts in 1970-71 and 1971-72 re publicity or information: Mr. Nystrom, 383. Presented, 387-8. Sess. Paper No. 284-3/50.

United Bank of Canada Act:

Petition received for an Act to incorporate under English and French versions of name, 9. Reported by Clerk of Petitions, 14. Bill C-164, Mr. Haidasz. 1st R, 35. Reported by Examiner of Petitions, 37. 2nd R after debate, on division, referred to Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, 39-40. Reported without amendment, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 3 to *Journals*, 67. Report stage; motion to amend title, agreed to, 195. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 195. 3rd R after debate, 195. Passed by Senate, 228. R.A., 232. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 24, S.C. 1972.

United Nations:

1. Petition received from Mr. Zafar Essak and others re Canada's participation in United Nations and world peace and report of Clerk of Petitions, 251.
2. Order,—Return re Canadian contributions toward general maintenance and special funds: Mr. Robinson—presented forthwith, 344. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/279.

United Nations Conference on the Human Environment:

1. Introductory statement by Hon. Jack Davis to plenary session held in Stockholm, June 5-16, 1972, 396. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/12. (*Printed as appendix to Hansard of June 21, 1972.*)
2. Text of Canadian proposals accepted in a plenary session, dated June 14, 1972, 396. Sess. Paper No. 284-7/12A. (*Printed as appendix to Hansard of June 21, 1972.*)

Uranium Canada:

Report for 1971, 492. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/407.

Urban Affairs:

Final report of Tri-Level Interim Planning Committee, dated May 19, 1972, 319. Sess. Paper No. 284-5/31. See also **Supply Matians**.

Urban Affairs Ministry:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Health, Welfare and Social Affairs Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 19 to *Journals*, 311.

V**Vagrancy:**

See **Criminal Code amendment; Criminal Law Amendment Act**.

Vancouver International Airport Act:

Bill C-94, Mr. Goode. 1st R, 25.

Veterans:

Ordered, that Veterans Affairs Committee be empowered to hear evidence from Hong Kong Veterans, National Prisoners of War and the Dieppe Veterans and Prisoners of War Associations, 279. Reported with recommendations, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 34 to *Journals*, 426-8.

Veterans Affairs Committee:

1. Membership, 32, 34, 256, 265, 302, 309, 380, 419, 431, 438.
2. Estimates referred: (1972-73 Main) Veterans Affairs Department, 30.
3. Bills referred: Pension Act amendment, 423.
4. Ordered, authorization to hear evidence from Hong Kong Veterans, National Prisoners of War and the Dieppe Veterans and Prisoners of War Associations, 279.
5. Reports: First (Veterans Affairs, Main Estimates, 1972-73) (Appendix 10 to *Journals*), 257; Second (War Pensions and Allowances Acts amendment) (Appendix 18 to *Journals*), 308; Third (Prisoners of war, pensions, with recommendations) (Appendix 34 to *Journals*), 426-8; Fourth (Pension Act amendment) (Appendix 35 to *Journals*), 434.
6. Reports concurred in: Third, without notice or debate, 505.

Veterans Affairs Department:

Estimates, Main, 1972-73, referred to Transport and Communications Committee, 30. Reported on, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 10 to *Journals*, 257.

Veterans Affairs Department Act:

See **War Pensions and Allowances Acts amendment**.

Veterans Insurance Act:

Financial statement on operations for 1971-72, 313. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/254.

Veterans' Land Act:

Expenditures and commitments for 1971-72, 504. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/256.

Victoria Day:

See **Holidays Act** amendment.

Visiting Forces Act:

See **Criminal Law Amendment Act**.

Votes Recorded in the Chamber:

See **Divisions, Recorded**.

W**War Claims Commission:**

Report entitled "War Claims Commission, World War II, 1970", 331. Sess. Paper No. 284-4/153.

War Measures Act amendment:

Bill C-153, Mr. Orlikow. 1st R, 26.

War Pensions and Allowances Acts amendment:

Bill C-208, Minister of Veterans Affairs—To amend certain Acts to provide that pensions and allowances payable thereunder will be escalated annually in relation to the Consumer Price Index. 1st R, 291. 2nd R moved and debate interrupted, 294. Debate resumed, 2nd R agreed to, referred to Veterans Affairs Committee, 300-1. Reported without amendment, committee evidence and proceedings recorded as Appendix 18 to *Journals*, 308. Report stage, 312. 3rd R after debate, 312. Passed by Senate, 317. R.A., 317-8. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 12, S.C. 1972.

War Veterans Allowances Act:

See **Family Income Security Plan Act; War Pensions and Allowances Acts** amendment.

Water Pollution:

1. Order,—Report by G. Chamaillard re survey of public information facilities as mentioned in answer to Question No. 1323 (p. 10597, *Hansard* of 1968-69 session): Mr. Skoberg; order having been called, was transferred to the order of "Notices of Motions (Papers)", 327.
2. Motion (by unanimous consent under S.O. 43).—Oil spill at Cherry Point refinery, referring to International Joint Commission for study of consequences, moved, 370. Motion (Mr. Fortin).—To proceed to Orders of the Day, negatived on recorded division, 370-1. Debate resumed; amendment (Mr. Nielsen).—Authorizing IJC to requisition resources to restore environment, moved and debate adjourned on motion, 371-2. Debate resumed, amendment and main motion agreed to, 375.

See also **Canada-United States Agreements, Notes, etc.**

Ways and Means:

1. Order of the Day for consideration of motions, 59, 421.
2. Notice of Motion to amend the Income Tax Act (Sess. Paper No. 284-1/308), 15.
3. Notice of Motion to amend the Income Tax Act (Sess. Paper No. 284-1/309), 280. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 426.
4. Notice of Motion to amend the Income Tax Application Rules, 1971 (Sess. Paper No. 284-1/310), 280. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 427.
5. Notice of Motion to amend the Excise Tax Act (Sess. Paper No. 284-1/311), 280. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 427.
6. Notice of Motion to amend Part IV of Chapter 63 of the Statutes of 1970-71-72 (Sess. Paper No. 284-1/312), 280. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 427.
7. Notice of Motion to amend the Customs Tariff (Sess. Paper No. 284-1/313), 280. Motion for concurrence, agreed to, 427.

Ways and Means (Budget):

1. Budget papers presented, 280. (*Printed as appendix to Hansard of Monday, May 8, 1972*).
2. Presentation (Mr. Turner, Ottawa-Carleton),—That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government, moved and debate adjourned on motion (Mr. Lambert, Edmonton West), 280. Debate resumed (1st appointed day); amendment (Mr. Lambert, Edmonton West),—Failure to relieve unemployment, stimulate investment and provide personal tax relief: moved, 291. Subamendment (Mr. Saltsman),—Reduction in personal income tax should replace tax cuts for corporations: moved and debate interrupted, 291. Debate resumed (2nd appointed day); subamendment negatived on recorded division, 295-7. Debate resumed (3rd appointed day) and interrupted, 319. Debate resumed (4th appointed day); amendment negatived on recorded division, 327-8. Debate resumed (5th appointed day) and interrupted, 378. Debate resumed (6th and final day), 379. Main motion agreed to on recorded division, 379-80.

West Coast Marine Traffic Reporting Zone Act:

Bill C-184, Mr. Groos. 1st R, 224.

West Coast Ports Operations Act:

Bill C-231, Minister of Labour—To provide for resumption of operations at west coast ports; to provide for appointment of mediators. 1st R, 507. 2nd R, after debate, 508. Considered in Committee of the Whole, 508, 509. Reported with amendments, concurred in at report stage, 3rd R, 509. Passed by Senate, 509. R.A., 509. 21 Elizabeth II, Chapter 23, S.C. 1972.

Wheat Board:

See **Canadian Wheat Board**.

Wiretapping:

See **Criminal Code amendment; Members of Parliament**.

Women, Status of:

Report entitled "Status of Women in Canada—1972", 275. Sess. Paper No. 284-4/104.

Y**Youth:**

Order,—Return re government support of Canadian Youth Hostels Association's approach to hostelling: Mr. Robinson—presented forthwith, 487. Sess. Paper No. 284-2/377.
See also **Supply Motions**.

Youth Allowances Act (Repeal):

See **Family Income Security Plan Act**.

Yukon Territory:

1. Ordinances made by the Council and assented to between Feb. 11 and Mar. 30, 1972, 309. Sess. Paper No. 284-1/263.
2. Senate representation: See **British North America Act amendment**.
See also **Canada Elections Act**.

Yukon Wilderness Limited:

Order,—Correspondence between John Lammers and Indian Affairs and Northern Development Minister: Mr. Orlikow, 272.



